THE PRIMITIVE TRADITION OF THE EUCHARISTIC BODY AND BLOOD

FRANCIS WATERMAN, D.D.

WASHINGTON
CATHEDRAL LIBRARY

A BEQUEST
FROM THE LIBRARY OF
ALFRED HARDING, D.D., LL.D.
SECOND BISHOP OF WASHINGTON

From the Library of

THE PRIMITIVE TRADITION OF THE EUCHARISTIC BODY AND BLOOD

FROM THE LIBRARY OF
THE INSTITUTE FOR
WORSHIP STUDIES
FLORIDA CAMPUS

THE PRIMITIVE TRADITION OF THE EUCHARISTIC BODY AND BLOOD

BY
LUCIUS WATERMAN, D.D.
RECTOR OF S. THOMAS'S CHURCH, HANOVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS
1919

BV
825
.W31

COPYRIGHT, 1919
BY LUCIUS WATERMAN

All rights reserved

CATHEDRAL LIBRARY
MOUNT ST. ALBAN

THE·PLIMPTON·PRESS
NORWOOD·MASS·U·S·A

THE BISHOP PADDOCK LECTURES

IN the summer of the year 1880, George A. Jarvis, of Brooklyn, New York, moved by his sense of the great good which might thereby accrue to the cause of Christ, and to the Church of which he was an ever-grateful member, gave to the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church certain securities, exceeding in value eleven thousand dollars, for the foundation and maintenance of a lectureship in said seminary.

Out of love to a former pastor and enduring friend, the Right Reverend Benjamin Henry Paddock, D.D., Bishop of Massachusetts, he named the foundation "The Bishop Paddock Lectureship."

The deed of trust declares that —

"The subjects of the lectures shall be such as appertain to the defence of the religion of Jesus Christ, as revealed in the Holy Bible, and illustrated in the Book of Common Prayer, against the varying errors of the day, whether materialistic, rationalistic, or professedly religious, and also to its defence and confirmation in respect of such central truths as the Trinity, the Atonement, Justification, and the Inspiration of the Word of God; and of such central facts as the Church's Divine Order and Sacraments, her historical Reformation, and her rights and powers as a pure and national Church. And other subjects may be chosen is unanimously approved by the Board of Appointment as being both timely and also within the true intent of this Lectureship."

Under the appointment of the Board created by the Trust, the Reverend Lucius Waterman, D.D., Rector of St. Thomas' Church, Hanover, New Hampshire, delivered the lectures for the year 1918–1919, contained in this volume.

6398

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/primitivetraditi0000luci

To

THE DEAR MEMORY

OF

JOHN HUMPHREY BARBOUR, D.D.

1854–1900

A GIFTED SCHOLAR · A DEVOUT PRIEST

A MAN OF HEAVENLY MIND

IN THE LIFE HERE THE CLOSE COMPANION OF THESE

STUDIES · ALWAYS CRITICAL · ALWAYS SYMPATHETIC

AND

FOR MORE THAN A QUARTER OF A CENTURY

MY FRIEND OF FRIENDS

PREFACE

THIS volume contains the Lectures delivered at the General Theological Seminary of the American Episcopal Church, in the academic year 1918–1919, on the Bishop Paddock Foundation. The view of the patristic teaching which is here presented has been clear before my mind for more than forty years, and has been a matter of growing conviction. It will be seen that I have not been in haste to put it forth. Indeed, I will be entirely frank and say that I have been oppressed with the thought that if I was the only person who understood the patristic writings in this way, — and for long I knew of no other person who entirely agreed with me, — my understanding of the Fathers must obviously be a *mis*-understanding. Also, I recall the brief popularity of certain novel explanations of the Eucharistic Mystery, which appeared about two generations ago, and I observe that to-day the names of the authors of them are no longer heard. On the other hand, I have encouraged myself in noting instances here and there in which careful students have ascribed to particular Fathers very much such a meaning as I had seemed to find in them. If the same students did not find the same teaching running all through the patristic writings, I have thought that perhaps that was because no one had put it into their minds to enquire if it was there. I may mention, also, that on the morning after I had delivered my first Lecture, I received from a Bishop whose theological opinions I had never

known at all particularly, and who had never known much of mine, a letter expressing his pleasure at my holding the position of Paddock Lecturer for this year, and his hope that I might put forth something which would be of service to the Church. He went on to say that for years he had been teaching, — and then came a terse, clear statement of the very point which I had been trying to state, the evening before, as the apostolic and primitive pre-supposition concerning our Lord's eucharistic body, and with this impressive statement a plain indication that my correspondent's mind had not only reached the same conclusion as my own, but travelled to it along the same path. The curious providence which brought me that letter on that day was, of course, a great encouragement. My correspondent's ministry and mine had been carried on in widely different parts of this great country. Perhaps he and I do not stand alone. I wish that I might find that I have been expressing the thought of many other students, who have done much quiet thinking, but have not felt any call to speak.

I have read rather recently in a magazine article a hasty phrase dropped from a pen which I greatly admire and value. It spoke of a certain eucharistic theory which I do not myself hold in respect as "a profane and impossible *heresy*." I have italicized the last word, to point my criticism, and I want to plead with this esteemed writer and those who think with him, and urge upon them that such a phrase is quite too hasty. For the last eight hundred years there has been no Catholic *explanation* of our Lord's words, "This is My body," "This is My blood." There is, I am sure, a Catholic doctrine touching the Holy Eucharist and it is this: "The consecrated bread is our Lord's very body, and the consecrated wine is our Lord's very blood." As to what is meant by those words, body and blood, there has never been any ecumeni-

cal decision. I think that there was once an ecumenical *agreement.* I have tried in these Lectures to show what it was. I may mention that I suppose that agreement to have remained, with little disturbance, but with a fading force of conscious memory on the part of the Church, for more than seven hundred years. S. John of Damascus seems to me to present it clearly and strongly in the middle of the eighth century. But it has been impossible for me to examine closely and fully the testimony of the Fathers beyond the first four hundred years of the Church's life. My references to that number of centuries are not to be taken as meaning that I have any idea that the Church's doctrine was different in three or four centuries next following.

In my references *Pusey* stands always for Dr. Pusey's volume, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers, being Notes on a Sermon,* etc. I have assumed that if an American student had any *Catena* of eucharistic references from the Fathers on his shelves, it would probably be that one. My references have been made to the edition in which the *Notes* were published, apart from the *Sermon,* in 1855. I have myself been much indebted to a *Catena* published by Rev. Charles Hebert, D.D., London, 1879, in which all quotations are given in the original tongues in foot-notes, along with the English version. The title of the book is *The Lord's Supper: History of Uninspired Teaching,* and the publishers were Seeley, Jackson and Halliday. It gives only representative passages for the different centuries, but covers all the centuries to the present day. I mention the book here, but have given no references to it. *Stone* in my references stands always for Dr. Darwell Stone's *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,* Vol. I. For those students — May their tribe increase! — who wish to look up the originals of my patristic refer-

ences, I have thought it best to send them to Migne's *Patrologia Latina* and *Patrologia Gracca*, referred to as *P. L.* and *P. G.* For writers lying outside the range of the *Patrologiae* I have given no reference to originals, not having examined the originals myself.

I owe thanks to my friends, Prof. Richard W. Husband and Prof. George D. Lord, of the Dartmouth College Faculty, for advice in regard to some matters of Latin and Greek scholarship. Neither of them is to be held responsible for any statement made in this book, nor for any rendering given. I owe very particular thanks also to the Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the General Theological Seminary, for kindly reading all my Lectures, which it was impossible for him to hear, and offering valuable criticisms on points of minor detail, while reserving his judgment on the main lines of thought. He also is not to be held responsible for anything contained in this book.

Lectures containing much quotation and discussion of authorities are apt to be very unsatisfactory to listen to, and very tiresome. As I remember the generous patience and unfailing kindness of my hearers, the Faculty, and a good many of the students of the Seminary in Chelsea Square, I feel that I must give myself the pleasure of a word of grateful thanks to them. Some of them must have thought my views seriously mistaken, and my work wasted; but they were patiently attentive and constantly kind. I trust that readers may not think it amiss that I have kept the Lecture form, and am still addressing myself to them as if they were hearers of the spoken word. It is asking more of them, but I do ask them, to trust to a writer whom they do not know, that it is a mark of modesty rather than of self-assurance that he should use the pronoun "I" in a way which will seem to some excessive. His purpose of heart is by no

means to say, "I think it, and I know that I am right," but rather, "I think it, and my hearers must judge, every one for himself. I can give you only that vision which God has given me to see. I know that God sometimes gives His servants visions that are misleading, for their discipline and for the world's discipline. To make mistakes, and work out the natural results of those mistakes, is part of every man's education. Here is my vision. Search it in the fear of God, to see whether it be false or true."

I may add that to any critics who may show me mistakes that I have made, or misunderstandings into which I have fallen, so as to make them clear to me, I shall be profoundly grateful. And so, whether for edification of others or for correction of myself, I commend my book to the gracious providence of God.

HANOVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE,
Commemoration of S. Anselm, 1919

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	Eucharistic Pre-Suppositions, Ancient and Modern, and Critical Observations on Some Modern Eucharistic Theories	3
II.	The Ephesine–Roman Tradition: Rome; Carthage; Milan	27
III.	The Use of Figurative Language in Holy Scripture, and the Testimony of the Alexandrian School	58
IV.	Bodies Identified, not Necessarily Bodies Identical, and Examination of the Testimonies of the Asiatic Schools	86
V.	The Great Writers between the Second and Third General Councils, Constantinople, A.D. 381, and Ephesus, A.D. 431: Latin Fathers	118
VI.	The Great Writers between the Second and Third General Councils: Greek Fathers	146
VII.	Later Theologians who Press the Parallel of the Incarnation and the Eucharist	184
Appendices		215
Notes		233

The Primitive Tradition of the Eucharistic Body and Blood

The Primitive Tradition of the Eucharistic Body and Blood

LECTURE I

EUCHARISTIC PRE-SUPPOSITIONS, ANCIENT AND MODERN, AND CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON SOME MODERN EUCHARISTIC THEORIES

I

The Excuse for the Writing of this Book

ONE who sets himself to tell anew the story of the Church's Eucharistic Tradition may well begin with an apology. The thought of devout students in our time is so hopelessly confused; who can hope to clear it? Men of decided views are so utterly divided in opinions; who can dream of bringing them together? The views of all the differing schools of thought have been so well represented by able advocates; who can imagine himself able to do better in presenting any of these rival theories? Especially after the two noble volumes of Dr. Darwell Stone's *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, careful, candid, scholarly, and devout, it seems to the present writer, at any rate, that he is bound to begin his writing with presenting some excuse for entering the field at all. His one excuse — an excuse which will have no effect with many persons but to make

his venture more deeply inexcusable — is simply this. He thinks himself to have found in the course of Christian History a shift in the Church's *pre-suppositions* in regard to the great mystery of the Holy Eucharist. Certainly, for eight hundred years the Church was at peace in regard to this matter. Certainly, in a period of barbarian invasion and oppression, when the Church's scholarship was decadent, the Church's memory dimmed, the Church's momentum almost at a standstill, the Church just turning with tears and fears from the burial of an old civilization to the baptism of a new evolution, out of which the Church was faintly hoping that some civilization might yet arise, — at such a time men began to think about the Holy Eucharist in new ways, and in regard to the doctrine of the Eucharist there has been confusion and strife among Christians ever since. The present writer finds at that great turning-point in the Church's history a momentous change in the Church's mental attitude, an unconscious shift in the Church's tradition. The object of this book is to bring to view again, if it be possible, the eucharistic pre-suppositions of the Church of the Apostolic Age.

II

Some Examples of Pre-supposition

Pre-suppositions are very important forces in the development of thought. Let us take the word "tradition," for example. There are two very different kinds of tradition, both of which have done much to make history, — the tradition that remembers, and the tradition that guesses and invents. When men discuss the value of tradition, and cannot at all agree, it is sure to be, partly, at least, because each of the disputants has started

with a pre-supposition, and they have not taken the trouble to understand one another enough to make sure of discussing the same thing. The one who praises tradition is thinking of tradition as a great memory. The Christian Church of the Apostles' days certainly understood rightly the broad lines, at any rate, of S. Paul's teaching in the Epistles, and (let us say) of the teaching of the Gospel according to S. John. The Church of the Apostolic Age did teach that general meaning rightly to the next generation. That is an example of the tradition that remembers. When we find the Church of the first three or four centuries, beginning with witnesses who were born before the death of S. Paul, and were contemporaries of S. John, always maintaining a certain broad line of religious thought as that of S. Paul, we may be sure that that was a memory of what S. Paul really did mean to teach. Holy Scripture, we know all too well, can be made to mean anything in the hands of clever controversialists of to-day. What the New Testament writings really did mean is found securely in the general agreement of the Church's memory, as to the main lines of that meaning, in the first centuries after the New Testament writers died. The tradition that remembers is a great and worthy thing. But the party of the other part, the man who inveighs against tradition, is thinking of something very different. He also has a pre-supposition. To him "tradition" means a mere fashion of thought, uncritical, unfounded. To him tradition is synonymous with guess-work. Moreover, he can point to examples of tradition, which have posed as venerable monuments of the Church's memory, and have been found to be specimens of pure invention after all. The Forged Decretals of the eighth century are a fine example. For three hundred years they have been

known to be impudent forgeries, but they are still quoted as authorities in the Canon Law of the Roman Communion.

Here, then, are two pre-suppositions, which to confuse must reduce argument upon their subject to a hopeless tangle. The advocate of tradition (the High Anglican, at any rate) assumes all through that the Church's scholars will distinguish carefully between a real memory from the beginning and a guess that rose to the surface sometime in the course of the ages, and became fashionable. He assumes, he *pre-supposes*, that scholars of his party will advance nothing under the name of tradition that cannot be proved to belong to the Church's continuous memory of Apostolic teaching and practice. The despiser of tradition, on the other hand, has his corresponding pre-supposition. He assumes with confidence that the man who values tradition must be a man to whom *all* tradition is authoritative, and who by his belief in the value of tradition is cut off from critical enquiry as to whether any given tradition has a value of its own, or not. Great is the power of unuttered pre-supposition in the working of the human mind.

III

Two Natural Pre-suppositions touching the Holy Eucharist, — the Modern and the Ancient

I have suggested the occurrence of an unconscious change in the pre-suppositions of Christian minds concerning the Holy Eucharist, at a time of very deep prostration and enfeeblement. Let us consider a little what would be the natural pre-suppositions of the Christian mind, a thousand years ago, and nearly nineteen hundred years ago, respectively.

A. *The Natural Pre-supposition of the Last Thousand Years.*

A thousand years ago, as now, a Christian thinker, approaching with reverent speculation our Lord's great words, "This is My body," would naturally begin with the idea that here was a great, a magnificent reality, mysterious, supernatural, transcending utterly all that human sense could perceive. Here are two facts, an earthly and a heavenly. So the Church has been teaching through all the ages. But now to the believer's heart the heavenly fact so utterly transcends the earthly fact that the earthly fact, the hallowed bread, sinks out of sight. To the believer's mind, then, the word "This" in our Lord's great saying will stand for the heavenly fact, and not for the earthly fact.

Secondly, this modern Christian mind, whether of the ninth century or of the nineteenth, is likely to be a mind to which the phrase "My body," coming from our Lord's lips, suggests but one possible subject of thought, — our Lord's body which rose from the grave, and ascended into heaven, and now sitteth at the right hand of God. That body is a thing glorified, mysterious, endowed with we know not what new, exalted capacities. That glorious body, then, we must think, is presented to our faith as the heavenly fact of the Eucharistic Feast. And we fall down, and adore. Or, peradventure, the revelation which these words suggest seems to us, on the other hand, to be impossible, and we feel bound to explain it in some way which to our brethren will seem to be an explaining away.

B. *The Natural Pre-supposition of the First Disciples.*

But in the year of our Lord's death it was different. Let us turn our thoughts back to the scene of the Institution of the Blessed Sacrament. The Apostles are reclining

at the table where they have been eating the Jewish Passover, itself a feast upon a sacrifice, where they have been taught that God's people eat the food of God. The supper is nearly ended, when their Master stands before them, and offers them a heavenly feeding that is new. First, He utters a long prayer of Thanksgiving (of *Eucharist*, to use the Greek name, which since has become familiar throughout the Christian world), and near the close of that prayer He blesses certain portions of bread and wine with words of consecration which have not been made known to us.[1] Then he gives of this hallowed bread and wine to the Apostles with these amazing words, — "This is My body," "This is My blood." I do not attempt to quote the phrases fully. I am concerned now to try to recover first impressions of mysterious words, and in first impressions only the chief outlines stand out clear. "This is My body!" What thoughts could that phrase suggest at that moment to our Lord's chosen followers? Plainly, their minds must have gone back with a rush of memory to the strange preaching of just a year before in the synagogue at Capernaum, when our Lord had promised in startling (and to many of His

[1] It is aside from my present subject, but I cannot pass by this point without remarking that the so-called "Words of Institution" are in fact "Words of Distribution," and that our Lord's real "Words of Institution" have not been handed down to us, not having been preserved in the memory of His Church. From the example of most of the ancient Liturgies we may safely assume that our Lord's form of consecration consisted of a prayer to the Divine Father to send the Holy Spirit to make this bread and wine the body and blood of the Son of His love. It would be hard to say what mischief this unhappy phrase, "the Words of Institution," and the unhappy (and almost impossible) assumption that the words of distribution are the words with which our Lord consecrated His first Eucharist have wrought in the fields of Liturgics and Dogmatic Theology.

followers, repellent) language that He would give His people His flesh to eat. He had vowed that they should eat His flesh and drink His blood. He had refused to explain. He had made it altogether clear that He had some great thing to reveal to them, and that it was a thing too mysterious to be capable of being explained. Now He was fulfilling that promise at last. Here was no more of explanation than before, but here at any rate was the promised fact. "This," He said, "is My body." "This," to those Apostles could have no other meaning than "This bread which I hold in My hands." To them, at that moment, the word "This" must refer to something visible and tangible, something that was, as we say, "in evidence," not (as moderns are apt to take it) to a supernal, invisible fact, with which the minds of these men had not yet been brought into acquaintance. That is the FIRST immediate pre-supposition of the Apostles' minds. "This is My body" must mean "This bread is My body."

The second pre-supposition of these men, just as immediate and inevitable, must have been this: "When our Lord says, 'This is My body,' He does not mean that the bread which He holds in His hands is the very body in which He stands before us, holding it. Evidently, He means that this bread is somehow His body, as well as the body of flesh in which He stands before us. This bread is His body as much as His natural [1] body is.

[1] In speaking of the body of our Lord's earthly life as "His natural body," I may remind some persons of that phrase of S. Paul, so unhappily rendered, even in our Revised Versions, "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." S. Paul's two Greek phrases indicate, as I suppose, (1) a body governed by the *soul* (seat of feelings and desires) and (2) a body governed by the *spirit* (seat of principles and conscience), respectively. A soul-body (*σῶμα ψυχικόν*) is contrasted with a spirit-body (*σῶμα πνευματικόν*). It may be observed that there is no ground

This new body is a continuation, an enlargement, of our Lord's body which we have always known. When we eat this bread of His, we are eating what He has made to be His flesh, we are made one with Him, our bodies are made one with His body. But this is a new embodiment, such as our Master has not had before."

The Apostles knew how differently our Lord used words from any other teacher. They remembered perhaps, in a sudden flash, how He had bidden them beware of the leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees, and they had thought, blunderingly enough, that He was talking of the leaven with which people make bread. They knew that they were always in danger of misunderstanding Him. They may well have feared that they were misunderstanding Him now. Or perhaps there was not time just then for *any* thought that was clear enough to be put into words. How much or little those Apostles thought is, for *us*, purely conjectural. But I am sure that so far as they did think, their immediate, natural presupposition from those words, "This is My body," must have been, "This also, this *as well as the body in which we have known Him heretofore*, is the body of our Master, Jesus, the Christ."

for supposing that a spirit-body is one whit less material than a soul-body. The contrast of "natural" and "spiritual" in our English Versions has unfortunately, though very "naturally," suggested a contrast of "*material*" and "spiritual" which cannot have been in S. Paul's mind. S. Paul would have been deeply shocked and irritated, if he could have foreseen our English misrepresentation of what he said. I suspect that he would even have cried in his distress, Ὦ ἀνόητε, "Thou fool!" For "body" is a word which in itself implies something material.

Of course, our Lord's body was never a "soul-body." It was always "spiritual." I am using the phrase "natural body" to denote the body which our Lord had by nature, what I suppose, S. Paul would have called σῶμα φυσικόν.

IV

Three Things, not One, called in Scripture the Body of our Lord

I once advanced such an idea of the meaning of our Lord's words to a Doctor of Sacred Theology, and he answered pettishly, "There is no such thing as another body. Our Lord has *but one* body." But that was an uncareful assertion, and quite contrary to fact. Three things are called in Holy Scripture by this one name, of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ. There is (1) His natural body, in which He was born, and died, in which He rose from death, and went into heaven. There is (2) His sacramental body, in the Eucharist. There is (3) His mystical body, the Church. Surely, our Lord might say of His Church on earth, "This is My body," and if He did so speak, all the Church would receive the saying without question, as meaning obviously, "This also is My body." "This, as well as my natural body of flesh and bones, is worthy to bear the great name of 'My body.'"

And here perhaps one may be permitted to enter into a reverent enquiry as to what is the fitness of that great title, by which the Church of Christ is called "the body of Christ." What, we must ask ourselves, is the essential fact of body? What makes a certain mass of material to be a man's body? I venture to suggest that it is the fact that that material organism is the vehicle of the man's life, and an instrument through which he may bring his life to bear upon the world. The common man has only one such embodiment. The Lord from heaven has more than one. To every human being who receives His Sacrament of Baptism our Lord imparts a share of

His own human life. It might be said, therefore, that the body of every Christian becomes an embodiment of the Christ, being what I have just now said, — "a vehicle of our Lord's life, and an instrument by which our Lord may bring His life to bear upon the world." But those who were guided by the Holy Spirit to form the phraseology of the infant Church did not teach us to call the body of each single Christian the body of Christ. If one may reverently conjecture, it would seem that our Lord is not willing to call by so great a name a body which is in so small a measure His own body, as that of an individual Christian, a body so much more largely animated by the life with which it was born than by *His* life, a body which is at times so largely the instrument of sinful desire, and evil will. But the society made up of all these persons whose bodies have received the indwelling life of Jesus is so greatly a vehicle of our Lord's life, and is, with all the sins and failures of its members, so greatly, so growingly, and (in its necessary evolution) so surely an instrument by which He brings His life to bear upon the world, that our Lord is willing to call that society by the name of His body. He rejoices to describe Himself as the Head of that body. It is, indeed, the fact that He is Himself the Chief Member of the society which we call the Church, which is the very greatest reason why He is willing to call that society by this magnificent name of His body on earth. Then, further, as He calls the Church on earth His body, He is willing to describe those who have been baptized into Him as members of that body. Nay more, He is willing that they should be known as members of His body in which He was born.

Certainly, the passage which we are in the habit of reading from the Epistle to the Ephesians (v. 30), "We are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones,"

was not so written by S. Paul. That is to say, the qualifying phrase, "of His flesh and of His bones," is an early gloss, and not from the Apostle. But the gloss only gives expression, one may feel sure, to what was really in S. Paul's mind. When one reads the Apostle's words to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xii. 12), "As the body is one, and hath many members, . . . so also is Christ," — not "so also is *the Church*," but "so also is *Christ*," — and again (1 Cor. vi. 15), "Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ? Shall I then take away the members of Christ, and make them members of a harlot? God forbid," we see that S. Paul was guided to think of our Lord as living in an embodiment in His Church on earth, which was, so to speak, an extension of the Incarnation, the Church being an addition to that body which was carried up into heaven, being in one sense another body, and yet in a sense the same body manifested in an enlargement of its function. Indeed, it may be said that in S. Paul's theology the Church as the body of our Lord is *identified, yet not identical*, with the body upon the heavenly Throne.

If Holy Scripture thus calls something "the body of Christ," which yet is not the same as the body of our Lord's earthly life, but another body, and yet again is an extension of that former body, in such wise as that all who have part in the body, the Church, have part also in the body that went into heaven, — if this be so, surely it is not a suggestion to be cast aside with hasty scorn that our Lord Jesus Christ, whose voice speaks to us in every Scripture inspired of God, might use such a phrase as "This is My body," to indicate some such fact of supernatural embodiment in His Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist. How the Church of the first five centuries did understand our Lord's words shall be con-

sidered in later Lectures. At present, I am asking only that you will hold your minds open to consider the possibility that our Lord *might* speak of a sacramental element as His body, even as He teaches us to call the Church of the baptized His body, without meaning necessarily that this, His body, is the body of His natural flesh.

V

Difficulties attach to all the Theories founded on the Modern Pre-supposition

I have indicated that the Apostles must have formed an instant pre-supposition, when they heard our Lord's words in the upper room, that "This is My body" must mean "This also is My body," "This bread is as worthy to bear the name of My body, as is My natural frame in which I stand before you." I freely acknowledge that if our Lord wished to save them from that pre-supposition by words of warning, either then or afterwards, He might have done so, and that the fact that no such words have been written for our learning is not an absolute bar to a theory that such words were said. If later we shall find reason for holding that the Apostles impressed upon the Church's mind what I have called "the *modern* pre-supposition," and that that is really the pre-supposition of all the Christian ages, then the natural first thought of the Apostles will have to be dismissed, to go along with so many of their natural first thoughts, which were, I further acknowledge, often altogether wrong. But I press the point that they must have had this pre-supposition at first, and I claim to have shown from the use of the phrase "Body of Christ" by inspired men in their teaching about the Church that such a use of the word "body" is not impossible and incredible in itself.

I must ask your attention now to certain difficulties which seem to me to attach to the various theories concerning the Holy Eucharist which have grown up out of what I have ventured to call "the modern pre-supposition." This pre-supposition includes, I here repeat, these two points, — that "This" points to the great heavenly Reality, not to the bread, and that "My body," spoken by our Lord, must mean "My body of My natural life," and *cannot mean anything else.*

1. Of modern theories I take up first that which is often called the Zwinglian, from the name of the Swiss reformer, Ulrich Zwingli. It starts out with the pre-supposition which I have indicated, and says, "Taken literally, this is impossible. The glorified body of our Lord cannot be in heaven and here at the same time, and on a thousand altars at once. Evidently, then, this utterance is simply figurative. 'This is My body' means 'This is a figure of My body.' Sacraments are pictures. They are symbols, — parables, if you will, — of great heavenly facts. But in the Sacrament itself is no great heavenly fact at all." I shall not spend much time in criticism of this theory. It has no standing in the Church to which I belong. It is, confessedly, the farthest removed of all possible eucharistic theories from the mind of the primitive Church. It is sufficient to say of it that it evacuates the Holy Eucharist of everything in the way of mystery. And if any one thing is more conspicuously manifest than another in regard to this Sacrament, it is this, that the subject is a mysterious subject. When our Lord predicted, a year before His death, that He would give His followers His flesh to eat, and His blood to drink, He shocked men so terribly that even His close followers fell away from Him in such numbers as to shock *Him* terribly in turn. Surely, it is manifest that

they regarded Him as having said something very mysterious. Surely, also, if what He really meant was something quite simple and un-mysterious, a mere commonplace of Oriental figurative speech, He would have explained His meaning at once. If the Zwinglian view of the Christian sacraments were indeed the truth of the Christian sacraments, a few words from our Lord would have prevented all that dreary loss of personal following then, and would have fastened that same simplicity of explanation upon the minds of His Apostles, and upon the mind of His Church for all time. But no! S. John evidently presents the subject of this feeding as a highly mysterious subject. So does S. Paul present both of the two chief Sacraments as effective powers, and mysterious powers. "As many of you as were baptized into Christ, did put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 27). "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16) A theory which describes the greater Sacraments as mere ineffective symbols of great truths is not consistent with the religion actually founded by our Lord.[1]

2. Turning to the opposite extreme, we have the theory which the Roman Communion has formulated,

[1] Careful readers of our Lord's discourse recorded in S. John vi. 26–65, will observe that our Lord does not first bid men eat His flesh, and drink His blood, and then explain by saying, "I am the bread of life." On the contrary, He first directs men's attention to the need of a heavenly feeding, then declares Himself to be the bread of life, the bread which cometh down from heaven, and then proceeds to define the particular kind of approach by which men are to come into touch with Him as the source of supernatural feeding. They are to come into touch with Him by way of His *flesh*. "The bread which I will give is My flesh." He does not explain words about flesh and blood in terms of spirit. He explains words of spirit in terms of flesh and blood. He *insists*, it may be said, on the sacramental method, — the approach to the spiritual through the material.

and has laid on all its followers as a matter of necessary faith.

The Zwinglian theory says that there is in our consecrated elements of bread and wine no supernatural fact at all. The Roman theory, of Transubstantiation, holds that these consecrated elements are so entirely taken up into the realm of the supernatural that there remains no natural substance. The bread is changed into the glorified body of our Lord, and the wine — into what? If I understand the Roman theology, I suppose that it must be said that the wine is changed into our Lord's body, too. At any rate, the consecrated elements are so changed into a greater and heavenly thing that nothing of the substance of bread or wine remains, but only appearances deprived of the reality which formerly underlay them. A theory embraced by so many saints, and supported by so magnificent a force of devout scholarship and consecrated intellectual power, must be criticized reverently, if one dare criticize it at all, but I *must* criticize it. I have no escape.

For, first, it seems to be inconsistent with such Scriptural language as S. Paul's, — "The bread which we break," and "We are all partakers of that one bread" (1 Cor. x. 16, 17), and with the habit, testified to and approved by Scriptural usage, of calling the Service of the Holy Eucharist by the name of "the breaking of the bread" (Acts ii. 42; xx. 7). Of course, it will be replied that the early Christians used the name of the appearance freely to designate the great Reality, when as yet no one had denied that Reality, and so taught worshipping saints to be more careful. But when we pass to the testimony of the primitive Church, I think that it must be said that we shall find careful theologians, like S. Justin Martyr and S. Irenaeus, speaking theologically,

and in their most careful theological utterances, making clear their belief that the elements of bread and wine continued still as bread and wine, after their consecration to be the body and blood of our Lord.

Of course, the strength of the Roman theory lies in its appearance of splendid literalness, — of taking our Lord's words exactly as they stand, and refusing to explain them away, — and in its appearance of exact conformity to the language of the primitive Church, which always spoke of the bread and wine of the Eucharist as being changed into something greater, rather than as being made to receive the presence of something greater. We shall find that language of the latter type, language which speaks of the body and blood of our Lord as being contained in, or spiritually discerned "in," or "under," the forms of bread and wine, is very rare in the speech of primitive Christianity.[1] The language of the Fathers does not represent our Lord's body and blood as being added to existing earthly elements of bread and wine. No! the nearly universal speech of the Christian Church, in the days when the eucharistic tradition was still fresh, speaks of the bread and wine as being changed into, made to become, the body and blood of our Lord. So far as the Roman theology conforms to that primitive speech, it has a very strong position.

But how far, after all, *can* the Roman theology claim this glory of exact conformity to the teaching of the primitive Church? And how far can the Roman theology claim "splendid literalness" in interpreting our Lord's words?

(*a*) As to the former point, I have already indicated S. Justin Martyr and S. Irenaeus as careful theologians who make it clear that in their eucharistic belief the

[1] See Note A, p. 233.

consecrated elements were regarded as still remaining bread and wine in their natural substances. I here add that in the controversy over the Eutychian heresy in the fifth century we shall find Catholic writers maintaining earnestly the continuing of the bread and wine of the Eucharist as bread and wine, and finding therein an analogy to the Incarnation of our Lord, where His human nature remains human nature, though taken into God. We shall find this maintained particularly interestingly by that eminent theologian, Theodoret, Bp. of Cyrrhus, in the middle of the fifth century, and by Pope S. Gelasius (noteworthy as the compiler of the Gelasian Sacramentary) at the century's close. Roman theology fails to echo primitive theology exactly in a very important point.

(*b*) As to the other point, of "splendid literalness," I have to submit that the Roman theology departs widely from literalness of interpretation in dealing with the words, "This is My blood." If Roman theology is literal in declaring that the consecrated bread is our Lord's body, because it is changed into His very Self, present in His body and blood, His soul, and His Divinity, it is hardly literal, — certainly, not "splendidly literal," — to say that the consecrated wine is our Lord's blood, because it is *His body*. The Presence is exactly the same in the two cases, according to the Roman theology, the great heavenly Reality is exactly the same in both. In the one case that great Reality is called our Lord's body. Why? Because the hallowed bread is a *symbol* of our Lord's broken body. In the other case the same great Reality is called our Lord's blood. Why? Because the consecrated wine is a *symbol* of our Lord's shed blood. Neither "This is My body" nor "This is My blood" is interpreted literally, when these two so different phrases are taken to convey one identical meaning.

(*c*) And here I am obliged to suggest a further criticism. Is our Lord's glorified body a body of flesh and blood? S. Paul tells us that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. xv. 50). I have suggested that the body is life's vehicle, and life's agent in laying hold upon the world. I add now that blood may be defined as life's instrument of renewal. Because a man's blood is the agent of perpetual renewal of his bodily life, blood stands in God's order as the symbol of renewal, and of life itself. But then also blood *may* be said to represent the possibility of decay. In a body raised above the possibility of decay, and therefore beyond the need of renewal, it would appear that blood would have no longer any office to fulfil. In that view blood would be one of the elements to be abolished in the body perfected. There *are* such elements in the human body, as we know it. "Meats for the belly," says S. Paul, "and the belly for meats; but God shall destroy both it and them" (1 Cor. vi. 13). "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." Are we to suppose, then, that our perfected bodies will be bodies of flesh and blood? Are we to suppose that *our* perfected bodies will *not* be bodies of flesh and blood, but that in our Lord's case the law has been suspended, and "flesh and blood" *has* inherited the kingdom? Are we to suppose that in this great particular our Lord is *not* the Pattern Man, nor our bodies, fashioned anew, to be truly conformed to the body of His glory? Nay, I venture to assert that our Lord's resurrection-body is to be regarded as a body of "flesh and bones," to use His own phrase (S. Luke xxiv. 39), and not of "flesh and blood." Literal blood our Lord cannot be supposed to have in the body of His glory.

"The Scripture cannot be broken." The Roman

theology would seem to be not "splendidly literal," but *grossly* literal in ascribing to our Lord's glorified body literal blood, which it has *not*, and curiously *un*-literal in requiring two phrases, which literally suggest quite different meanings, to sustain precisely the same meaning.

3. Returning now to the opposite approach to our great subject, we find another, and much more creditable attempt at non-literal interpretation of the words "This is My body" in "the Calvinistic Theory." Its upholders of the present time prefer to call it "the Virtualist Theory." It maintains, with the Zwinglian, that the consecrated elements are mere symbols, that there is no Heavenly Reality in them, but it insists that they are, in the language of our Articles of Religion (Art. XXVIII), "effectual signs," in the Latin of the Articles, *efficacia signa*. Though mere symbols in themselves, these elements are our Lord's body and blood in force and efficacy. A favorite formula with those who hold the Virtualist Theory is this: "The presence of Christ is to be looked for in the Sacrament, but not in the elements." There is a supernatural and special presence of our Lord, — yea, even of His body and blood, some followers of this school would say, — but this presence is not associated with the consecrated bread and wine. It is a presence in the faithful receiver only.

As against the Zwinglian view, this theory has the strength of a fair recognition of the element of mystery in our Lord's Sacrament. It recognizes that a great Reality is given and received. As against the Roman theory, it has the strength of a just recognition of the earthly element remaining still, even after the consecration of the Sacrament. But it is open to the objection that it diverges hopelessly from the mind of the whole Catholic Church of the first five hundred years of Chris-

tianity, in denying that the elements themselves are changed by the consecration in the Eucharist, and raised to a higher and supernatural plane of being. The whole primitive Church certainly held that the consecrated elements were made by their consecration to be something great and heavenly. Further, the whole primitive Church held that unfaithful men, coming to the Holy Communion, received the body and blood of the Lord, and that it was a very dreadful thing for them to do, so to touch the Ark with profane hand, like Uzza. And surely that is the only simple and natural way of taking S. Paul's words about the man who "eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern[1] not the body" (1 Cor. xi. 29). Could S. Paul have thought of a man as *eating and drinking* judgment, in an unfitting approach to the Sacrament, unless he had thought of that bread and wine as being somehow heavenly powers? With all the honorable support which it has had in the last four centuries, the Virtualist Theory is certainly a late invention. It is clearly another Gospel. It had no place in the Church's mind and heart, as the Church came forth from the teaching of the Apostolic Age. The whole primitive Church did believe and maintain that the consecrated bread and wine of the Holy Eucharist were in some sense really the body and blood of our Lord, having suffered in the consecration some transforming, elevating change, which made them to be different things from what they were before.

4. But if the Virtualist Theory of the eucharistic Presence must be set down as a late invention, so also, it

[1] The margin of the Revised Versions, both English and American, assures the student that S. Paul's Greek word really means, "discriminating." The translation should be, "if he fail to discriminate the Lord's body."

seems plain to me, must be the theory which I shall call for convenience "the Theory of the Oxford School." It is that which is found in the writings of Dr. Pusey, of Mr. Keble, and of most of the scholars who may be classed as "High Anglicans" in the last century. A particularly honored, and honorable, advocate of this theory among living scholars is Dr. Darwell Stone. It differs from the Roman Theory in only one point, — a very crucial point, certainly. It holds to the continuance of the bread and wine of the Eucharist in their natural and proper substances after the consecration. In this particular it goes along with the thought, and constant teaching, of the primitive Church. But, on the other hand, it states the Heavenly Reality, what it calls the *Res Sacramenti*, in the precise language of the Roman theologians. It loves to say that our Lord is present in the entirety of His Being, — the whole Christ, His body and blood, His soul, His Divinity, — in every particle of the bread and in every drop of the wine. It is carefully explained, as by the Roman theologians, that this Presence is after a manner not known to our philosophy. The body of our Lord is present after the manner of a spirit. The presence is "supra-local," "hyperphysical." Such theology can use Cardinal Newman's language: "When the consecrated Host is carried in procession, the body of our Lord does not move from place to place." About the philosophical questions thus raised, I must speak presently. At present, I am concerned with this one point. According to the Oxford Theory, the bread remains, and a greater thing is added, that is to say, our Lord's body. The wine remains, and a greater thing is added, that is to say, our Lord's blood. It must be observed that according to their view the consecrated bread is not really our Lord's body; it is a

vehicle of His body. The consecrated wine is not our Lord's blood; it is a vehicle of His blood. The followers of the Oxford School may say that they mean just exactly what the early Christian writers meant. It remains that the natural language of the early Christian writers is not the natural language of these pious and studious Anglicans.

The Oxford School says, "Here are two realities, an earthly and a heavenly. The earthly reality is bread, and the heavenly reality is our Lord's body." But surely the Oxford School would have to acknowledge that it finds these two realities to be *different* realities. The bread is one thing; our Lord's body is another thing. But the primitive Church declares with one voice that the consecrated bread of the Eucharist *is* our Lord's body, and that the consecrated wine *is* His blood. The primitive Church speaks of two realities, an earthly and a heavenly, and does not try to tell us what that heavenly reality *is;* but it says that by the addition of some (undefined) heavenly power to the earthly reality that earthly reality becomes, — not contains, but *becomes*, — the body, or the blood, of the Lord. Certainly, the natural language of the Oxford School is that our Lord's body is present "*in* the bread," or "under the form of bread." [1] Certainly, the natural language of the early Church was that the bread of the Eucharist *is* our Lord's body, or is *changed into* our Lord's body. The two atmospheres are not the same.

[1] For passages alleged to show that the Fathers used such language see Note A, p. 233.

VI

The Simplest Theory is the Best

It is painful to me to follow with what must seem unsympathetic criticism some of the tenderest and most devout meditations of friends whom I love and scholars whom I admire; but I must add here, in closing my Lecture for to-day, some critical reflections which apply equally to the Roman Theory and to that of the Oxford School. The best theory of any matter is that which fits all the facts and accounts for them most simply.

I observe, then, (*a*) that both the Roman view and the Tractarian are liable to objection in that our Lord in His Sacrament seems to offer us two different gifts, His body and His blood, and these theologians explain to us that the gift given is in both cases one and the same. The theories do not seem here quite to fit the given facts. It may be replied that the external symbolism of the broken body and the shed blood was so important in our Lord's purpose as fully to justify His using these two names for His one Presence under two symbolical veils. Such an explanation seems to me not impossible, but certainly not simple. A theory which should be able to fit all the facts, and fit them more simply, would demand our respectful attention.

I observe, further, (*b*) that these two theories do not seem to fit the facts of matter and spirit, as we are allowed to know them. Both theories assume that our Lord's body is present in our Sacrament after the manner of spirit. That is, returning to the conditions of the original Institution, we must hold that our Lord's natural body, not yet glorified, was raised above the laws of matter, and was present after the manner of spirit, in every

particle of the bread and in every drop of the wine. Certainly, our Lord's natural body could do supernatural things, — could walk on the sea as on a floor, could pass through closed doors. But can any material body, even our Lord's body, exist anywhere after the manner of spirit? Can any presence in a place be supra-local? Can any presence of a material *body* in a place be hyper-physical? Such suggestions seem to contradict all that God has made known to us of His world. I acknowledge that this notion of the possibility of a material body existing after the manner of spirit *may* be *true*. There is a modern Philosophy which leans toward the notion that force is the only fact, and that such words as "spirit" and "matter" represent only crude guesses which men have made in their ignorance, to cover phenomena which they did not in the least understand. Then, it might be added, Almighty God had to use these clumsy words of ours to make His revelations intelligible enough to be useful. If God's revelations seem ever to land us in self-contradiction, it is because of the weakness of our words and of our minds. Certainly, if God *has* revealed to us any such startling pronouncement as that matter can exist after the manner of spirit, we must accept it as settled fact. But I venture to assert that Almighty God has not revealed any such thing. The primitive Church does not seem to have taught any such thing. It is a guess of theologians.[1]

[1] For a further difficulty suggested by our Lord's phrase, "My blood which is being poured out," see Note B, p. 239.

LECTURE II

THE EPHESINE-ROMAN TRADITION

ROME; CARTHAGE; MILAN

IN my first Lecture I set forth two pre-suppositions concerning our Lord's Eucharistic Presence, which I think to have occupied men's minds at different periods of Christian history. Meeting the phrase, "This is My body," the modern pre-supposition, the pre-supposition of the last thousand years, is that the word "This" refers to the Heavenly Reality, and not to the earthly element,[1] and again, that "My body" must mean our Lord's natural body, and cannot mean anything else. Meeting that same phrase, "This is My body," the pre-supposition of the whole Church of the first four centuries, was, if I have rightly understood its expression, that the word "This" referred to the earthly element, and that the Lord's body, which He thus announced must, of course, be a body additional to His natural body, a body informed with the life that was in His natural body, a body

[1] The Zwinglian School referred "This" to the sacramental element, and escaped the resulting difficulty by refusing to the Eucharist any Heavenly Reality at all. I am rejoiced to find among High Anglican friends a readiness to resent this suggestion, and to say, as I should say, that to make "This" refer to anything but the bread or wine would be ungrammatical. It remains for such to explain in what sense they hold bread to *be* our Lord's body. That has not been made clear to me. But the unexpected agreement is most welcome.

different from His natural body, and yet in a sense the same as the natural body. I must now proceed to an examination of the utterances of the Christian writers of these four centuries to see whether they show with any clearness the presence of one of these pre-suppositions, or the other. For the period preceding the Second General Council (Constantinople, A.D. 381) I have thought it best to follow a geographical, rather than a merely chronological, order, grouping my writers with reference to three great local centres of tradition, Rome, Alexandria, Antioch. It seems to me that to trace the tradition of a great School tells more than to skip from name to name, quoting an utterance from Italy, and another from Egypt, a word from Jerusalem, and a word from Constantinople, simply because they were spoken in that order of time. Also, I begin with Rome, not only because that was the great central city of the world, where (as Irenaeus has taught us in a famous passage) the faith was preserved because all men of all minds resorted there from all directions, and so the thoughts of all manner of thinkers were there brought into a focus, but because two great theologians, who resided and taught in Rome, and profoundly affected Rome's theological tradition, had, both of them, their own initiation into the Christian tradition at Ephesus, and so were brought into a special nearness to S. John. S. John had lived at Ephesus to the very end of the first century. S. John seems to have been making a deep impression on the Church's mind, and doing much to form the Church's tradition, long after any other of the original Apostles of our Lord. It follows that these two theologians, S. Justin Martyr, who became a Christian at Ephesus within thirty years after S. John's death, and was for some years a student there, and S. Irenaeus, who was a friend and follower of

S. Polycarp, the aged Bishop of Smyrna, and used to hear S. Polycarp talk of the days when *he* was a pupil of S. John, — these two teachers, Justin and Irenaeus, are the nearest to a clearly apostolical tradition of all the Christian writers who give us material for any theory of the Eucharist. I shall state as the subject of this Lecture,

The Ephesine-Roman Tradition,

and I shall note the names of three cities in which that tradition flourished, Rome, Carthage, Milan.

A. *The Ephesine-Roman Teachers*

I

S. Justin Martyr, Philosopher (*circa* A.D. 150)

I begin with the testimony of S. Justin Martyr. In his First Apology, Chapter 66, he gives an account of the Christian Eucharist,

"of which," he says, "no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins, and is so living as Christ hath enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these things, but in like manner as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, having been made flesh by the Word of God ["Word of God" is here a title of the Holy Ghost] had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which has been blessed by the invocation of the Word that is from Him, and from which our blood and flesh are by transmutation nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the Apostles, in the Memoirs composed by them, which are called 'Gospels,' have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them, that Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, said, 'This

is My body,' and that after the same manner, having taken the cup, and given thanks, He said, 'This is My blood,' giving it to them alone." [1]

Two points come out very clearly. First, the consecrated bread is still bread in S. Justin's view. It is not "common bread." A startling change has come upon it. Of that I must speak presently. But still these elements continue to be bread and wine, "from which our blood and flesh are by transmutation nourished." A modern Roman theologian may insist that "nourishment" is one of the "accidents," which remain, according to Roman theory, when "the substance" of bread and wine has ceased to be. Granted, for the sake of argument, that such a notion is philosophically conceivable. But what could have been S. Justin's object in introducing such a phrase as this in writing to the heathen Emperor? The only idea that Justin's words could have conveyed to Antoninus Pius, and the only idea that Justin's words could have been *intended* to convey, was just simply this, that the bread and wine, so wonderfully transformed, were transformed by a glorifying addition, *without losing anything of their natural conditions in the change.*

We turn, then, secondly, to S. Justin's view of the great transformation, on the positive side, and we find him presenting it as something analogous to our Lord's Incarnation. As our Lord took material elements of the substance of the Blessed Virgin by the operation of the Holy Ghost, here called "the Word of God," so by the operation of the same Word [2] our Lord takes to Him-

[1] *Patrologia Graeca*, 6, col. 428, 429.

[2] S. Justin's phrase is δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ. I should render this, "by invocation of the Word that proceeds from Him," that is, of the Holy Ghost. Dr. Pusey translates, "by the prayer of the word which is from Him," on p. 319 of *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*

self material elements of bread and wine, and makes them to be somehow His body and His blood. If S. Justin had wished to say that these elements received a mysterious presence of our Lord's body he could have said so, and it might even have been a simple thing to say. What he does say is, that as our Lord once incarnated Himself by the power of the Holy Ghost, making human flesh to be His body, so He now makes bread and wine to be His body and His blood.

II

S. Irenaeus, Bishop (*circa* A.D. 175)

The next witness to be heard is S. Irenaeus. Though Bishop of Lugdunum in Southern Gaul (our modern "Lyons"), he had been a pupil of S. Polycarp, who was a pupil of S. John, and he knew Rome intimately as well. He uses the generally accepted doctrine of the Eucharist to enforce the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, on this wise:

as taught by the Fathers, but paraphrases, "by prayer in His words" (plural), on p. 144.

Bishop Hedley (R. C.) in his book, The Holy Eucharist, p. 25, renders it, "by the utterance in prayer of the word derived from Him." Whether Justin's phrase, here used, is to be taken as meaning, "by invocation of the Holy Ghost," or "by the recital of our Lord's two phrases, 'This is My body,' 'This is My blood,'" it is certainly the doctrine of the Catholic Church that the consecration of the Holy Eucharist is an operation of the Holy Ghost, and S. Justin's intention to draw a parallel between the Mystery of the Incarnation and the Mystery of the Eucharist is unmistakable. It may be remarked that the recital of our Lord's words of distribution in the Canon of the Eucharist is *not* "prayer in His words," and that "utterance in prayer of the word derived from Him" is quite impossible as a *translation* of the Greek words given above. Somehow or other, δι' εὐχῆς means, "by prayer." For the use of the title "Word" see Note C, p. 241.

CATHEDRAL LIBRAR
MOUNT ST. ALBAN

"How say they that that flesh passeth to corruption, and partaketh not of life, which is nourished from the body of the Lord and His blood? Either let them change their mind, or abstain from offering the things above spoken of. But our meaning is in harmony with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist confirms our meaning. And we offer to Him His own, carefully teaching the communication and union, and confessing the resurrection of the flesh and spirit. For as the bread from the earth, receiving the invocation of God,[1] is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies, receiving the Eucharist, are no longer perishable, having the hope of the resurrection to life everlasting." [2]

Here we have the same teaching as in Justin Martyr, that the consecrated elements are no longer "common," and yet that the common bread remains, with its power to nourish. In fact, the Eucharist consists of "two things, an earthly and a heavenly." And here comes a very critical question. Does Irenaeus mean to say that the "earthly thing" *is* the "heavenly thing"? I confess that that does not seem to me possible. But Irenaeus and Justin and all the Fathers say that the bread of the Eucharist *is* after consecration the body of our Lord. We may express the idea by an equation: the "earthly thing" (bread) + the "heavenly thing" = "the body of our Lord." Or again, the "earthly thing" (wine) + "the heavenly thing" = "the blood of our Lord." There is nothing to show (what seems to be assumed in modern writing) that S. Irenaeus held the "heavenly thing" of the Eucharist to be itself our Lord's body. What

[1] It may be noted that Irenaeus seems to regard the consecration as effected by prayer, rather than by formula. His language harmonizes with the interpretation which I have given to S. Justin's "prayer of the Word that is from Him."

[2] *Adv. Haer.* IV. xviii. 5; *P. G.* 7, 1028, 1029.

Irenaeus did hold to be the "heavenly thing" of the Eucharist will appear from another passage. It is in the *Adversus Haereses*, V. ii. 2, 3. He is again arguing for the resurrection of man's body against the objections arising out of a falsely "spiritual" conception of the universe.

"Since we are His members, and are nourished through the creature, and He Himself giveth us the creature, making His sun to rise, and raining, as He willeth, He owned the cup which is from the creature to be His own blood, from which He bedeweth our blood, and the bread from the creature He affirmed to be His own body, from which He increaseth our bodies. When, then, both the mingled cup and the created bread receive the Word of God, and the Eucharist becometh the body and blood of Christ,[1] and from it the substance of our flesh is increased, and consisteth, how do they say that the flesh is not capable of receiving the gift of God, which is eternal life, [that flesh] which is nourished by the body and blood of the Lord, and is His member, as the blessed Paul saith that we are all 'members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones,' not speaking thus of some spiritual and invisible man, for a spirit hath not bones nor flesh, but of the dispensation by which our Lord became an actual man, consisting of flesh and sinews and bones, — [that flesh, I say,] which is nourished both from His cup which is His blood, and from the bread which is His body. And just as a cutting from the vine planted in the ground fructifieth in its due season, and the corn of wheat, falling into the earth and becoming decomposed, riseth with manifold increase by the Spirit of God, who containeth all things, and then through the wisdom of God serveth for the use of men, and having received the Word of God, becometh the Eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ; so also our bodies, being nourished by it, and deposited

[1] The Greek original, here happily preserved, runs thus: *καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ*. "The Eucharist becomes a body of Christ," or "becomes body of Christ," not "*the* body of Christ." For some words on this distinction see Appendix I, pp. 220–222.

in the earth, and suffering decomposition there, shall rise at their appointed time, the Word of God granting them resurrection to the glory of God, even the Father." [1]

I note with interest the repeated references to the eucharistic body and blood of our Lord as nourishing our bodies and bedewing our blood, but my chief concern in quoting this passage is to give the answer of S. Irenaeus to the question, "What is that 'heavenly part' which is added to the earthly elements?" Irenaeus says that it is "the Word of God." He does not say that it is "the body of the Lord." He says that it is "the Word." This seems to me to be S. Justin's thought again. The Eucharist is a sort of second Incarnation. The Word of God takes to Himself these material elements and lives in them, and they become His body and His blood. And certainly, the "Word of God" here mentioned is not our Lord's phrase, "This is My body," regarded as a formula of consecration. "The Word of God granting them resurrection" is a phrase which sufficiently establishes that this is a use of S. John's great title for our Lord Himself. I will not enter upon the question whether our Lord by His omnipresence is everywhere present in His *body*, "after the manner of spirit." I do not think it, but I will not venture to deny it. Only I will suggest that as at every Baptism our Lord through the operation of the Holy Ghost visits some child of man, imparting to the person thus baptized a share in our Lord's human life, incarnating Himself anew in this new Christian, so our Lord may visit the elements of every Christian Eucharist, incarnating Himself in this bread and wine. He, with His Gift of Life, is "the Heavenly Part." Such seems to me to be the theology of Irenaeus.

[1] *P. G.* 7, 1124, 1125.

Before leaving the testimony of Irenaeus I must make one remark on what I have been reading from him, and then add two further extracts from his writings. First, I must remark that when Irenaeus speaks of our Lord as acknowledging the bread and wine of the Eucharist to be "His own body" and "His own blood," we must not assume, as the modern mind is likely to assume, that "His *own* body" means necessarily "His *natural* body." Modern readers start with such a pre-supposition, that there is, and can be, no other body which is our Lord's own body. If, as I suppose, S. Irenaeus had the opposite pre-supposition, that, of course, our Lord's eucharistic body was (in a sense) another body from His natural body, he could as perfectly naturally write of our Lord's acknowledging the body of the Eucharist to be His very own, as if he were referring to the body natural.

I proceed to offer two extracts which will curiously balance each other. The former one is taken from the fifth book of the *Adversus Haereses* (ii, 2), from an argument directed against those heretics who denied the resurrection of the flesh.

"But if it will not be saved," says Irenaeus, "in truth, the Lord hath not redeemed us by His blood, nor is the cup of the Eucharist the communication of His blood, nor the bread which we break the communication of His body. For blood is not, save of veins and flesh and of the rest of human substance, in which the Word of God was truly made. By His blood He redeemed us, as also His Apostle saith: 'In whom we have redemption through His blood, even the remission of our sins." [1]

What does Irenaeus mean? He is arguing against the falsely spiritual notion that regards matter as essentially

[1] *P. G.* 7, 1125.

evil, and he appeals to the well-known fact that our salvation is declared in God's own teaching to be dependent on material things. We are saved by the blood of Christ. We receive a material element which He names with the name of His own blood in the Eucharist. But certainly "blood" is a word of material association. "Blood" (in the natural sense) animates flesh, and pours through veins. If our Lord never had a real body, there could be no such thing as salvation through His blood, nor any giving of anything that could be called His "blood." There must be blood in a natural sense, or there could not be blood in the sacramental sense, is the thought of our saint.

That I have a right to represent Irenaeus as distinguishing in his own mind between a natural and a sacramental sense of such a phrase as "the blood of our Lord," will appear plainly from the next, which shall be our last, extract. It is taken from a Commentary on 1 Peter iii. by Ecumenius, a writer of the tenth century, who was able to quote from a writing of Irenaeus, which is now no longer extant.

"When the Greeks, having arrested the slaves of Christian catechumens, then used force against them, in order to learn from them some secret thing (practised) among Christians, these having nothing to say that would meet the wishes of their tormentors, except that they had heard from their masters that the divine Communion was the body and blood of Christ, and imagining that it was actually flesh and blood, gave their inquisitors answer to that effect."

The story, as taken from Irenaeus, goes on to tell how the charge was brought against the martyr, Blandina, and she

"replied very admirably in these words: 'How should those persons endure such accusations who for the sake of the practise

of piety, did not avail themselves even of the flesh that was permitted them?'" [1]

Now all the early Christians believed that what they received in the Holy Eucharist was "actually flesh and blood" — in a sense. How then could the martyr Blandina indignantly deny the accusation, and the bishop, Irenaeus, commend her for doing so? Because the bread and wine of the Holy Communion were not held to be bread and wine in a literal sense. The eucharistic body of our Lord could be described as the flesh of the Lord Himself, and even as the flesh which rose from the grave and went into heaven, or it could equally be said that it was not flesh at all. The language of the Fathers, the *belief* of the Fathers, makes room for both kinds of utterance.

B. *The North African School*

We shall find the same paradoxical contrast in the language of Tertullian of Carthage, the priest who brought to his theology the training of a lawyer. The Roman Church itself produced few writers in the first four Christian centuries, and none that offer us any help for our present study; but it taught some other Churches, and Churches which produced very eminent writers, its own particular tradition. Rome was the natural source of intellectual fashions to Northern Italy in one direction, and to the Province of Africa, — Carthage and its belongings, — in another. We shall be following faithfully the line of the Ephesine-Roman tradition, if we pass from Justin Martyr and Irenaeus to African Tertullian and Cyprian, and then to Ambrose of Milan, and his imitator, the author of the treatise, *De Sacramentis*.

[1] *P. G.* 7, 1236.

III

Tertullian, Lawyer, Presbyter, Schismatic (*circa* A.D. 200)

We take first the language of Tertullian. He is insistent that we receive our Lord's body in the Eucharist. In his book on Idolatry he is fierce against the maker of idols who dares to approach the altar. "Mourning . . . that he should approach those hands to the body of the Lord, which bestowed bodies on demons. . . . Whose hands ought more to be cut off than those by which the body of the Lord is offended?" [1]

That Tertullian holds the bread and wine of the Eucharist to be themselves the body and blood of the Lord, and not merely vehicles of those mighty powers, appears in his book *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, where he uses this very remarkable language, — "The flesh feeds on the body of Christ, that the soul, too, may be fattened from God" (*De Res. Carn.* 8). The body of our Lord is something that nourishes human flesh.[2] On the other hand, he speaks of the consecrated elements as "bread" and "wine." "We feel pained if any of the wine, or even of our bread, be spilled upon the ground." [3] In

[1] *De Idol.* 7; *P. L.* 1, 669.

[2] The reference is *P. L.* 2, 852. It is, of course, open to the Roman theologian to say that the power to nourish is one of the "accidents" of the eucharistic bread, and so the glorified body of our Lord has power to nourish the body of the receiver. But certainly, unless a man holds that the bread has disappeared, leaving its "power to nourish" as an attribute of another substance, such a phrase as "The flesh feeds on the body of Christ" is clear and emphatic for the belief that it is the bread itself which is the body of Christ. But Tertullian, as I shall proceed at once to show, held no such belief as that the bread ceases to be.

[3] *De Corona*, 3; *P. L.* 2, 99.

fact, he appeals to the outward senses with all confidence, as witnessing truly, as far as they go.

"We may not, we may not, call in question those senses, lest their truth should be questioned in Christ Himself, lest it should be said, perchance, that He saw untruly Satan cast down from heaven; or heard untruly the voice of the Father bearing witness of Him; or was deceived when He touched Peter's mother-in-law; or perceived as other than it was the breath of the ointment which He accepted for His burial; or afterwards the taste of the wine which He consecrated to be a memorial of His blood. For so Marcion preferred to believe Him a phantom, denying to Him the reality of a perfect body." [1]

A Roman theologian might think Tertullian's argument that if our senses could be deceived in a sacrament, then our Lord's senses might be supposed to have been deceived in any of the experiences of His earthly life, to be an absurdly unfair argument. Tertullian's arguments were often unfair, and some of them were even absurd. But certainly, the man who advanced that argument did not think that the senses *were* deceived in the presence of the eucharistic elements. Furthermore, it is to be noted that Tertullian was here arguing against the Docetic heresy of Marcion, who refused to believe that our Lord had any material body of flesh and blood at all. If, then, the Marcionites could have pointed to the accepted doctrine of the Catholic Church as teaching that the consecrated bread and wine had no longer any material existence, the retort, as Dr. Pusey well points out (*Doctrine of the Real Presence as taught by the Fathers*, 79, 80), would have been absolutely crushing. But let it be observed that when Tertullian is trying to prove by the material reality of the eucharistic bread and wine the material reality of our Lord's natural body of flesh

[1] *De Anima*, 17; *P. L.* 2, 718.

and blood, he describes the eucharistic wine as a "memorial" of our Lord's natural blood. The natural blood is one thing; the "blood" of the Eucharist is another. In like manner, in his book against Marcion, Tertullian twice calls the eucharistic bread a "figure" of our Lord's body natural. His argument is precisely that a real thing, which the eucharistic bread confessedly is, cannot be any proper "figure" of a thing which is *not* real. The first of these passages runs thus:

"For as God revealed in your Gospel,[1] too, calling bread His body, that hence, too, thou mayest at once understand that He gave to bread to be a figure [2] of His body, for whose body the prophet aforetime used bread as a figure, the Lord Himself designing to give an interpretation of this mystery by and by." [3]

Later in the same treatise Tertullian has a long passage, as follows:

"Having declared, 'with desire have I desired to eat this Passover,' [treating it] as His own (for it were unworthy that God should desire anything not His own), He made the bread which He took and distributed to His disciples to be that body of His, saying, 'This is My body,' that is, the figure of My body. But it would not be a figure unless His body were a veritable body.[4] But an empty thing, as a phantom is, can admit of no figure of itself. Or if He pretended that the bread was His body, because He had in truth no body, He must have given

[1] It will be remembered that Marcion recognized no Gospel but that of S. Luke.

[2] Tertullian has just been quoting from Jeremiah xi, 19, "Come, let us destroy the tree with the bread (English Versions, "fruit") thereof." The Fathers found in this verse a reference to the Cross and the eucharistic bread. Some remarks on current translations of this passage may be found in Note D, p. 247.

[3] *Adv. Marcion.*, III. 19; *P. L.* 2, 376.

[4] Tertullian's phrase is *corpus veritatis*, "a body of truth."

bread for us. It would fit with the emptiness of Marcion, that bread should have been crucified. But why doth He call *bread* His body, and not rather a pumpkin, which is what Marcion must have had in place of a heart? Marcion did not understand that that was an ancient figure of the body of Christ, who said Himself through Jeremiah, 'They have devised devices against me, saying, Let us cast wood on His bread,' that is the Cross on His body. Therefore the Illuminator of the things of old hath plainly shown what He meant bread to signify, calling bread His own body." [1]

To Tertullian, then, the hallowed bread appeared to be a figure of our Lord's body natural, and he seems to have found a close parallel between the figure by which the eucharistic bread was called our Lord's "body," and that by which our Lord's body was called "bread." Our Lord's body was called bread, because it was intended that in His good time it should perform the office of a great, world-wide nourishment. The eucharistic bread was called our Lord's body, because it was consecrated to perform the office of a body for Him, becoming in very truth a vehicle of His life, an instrument of His activity, and even a means of His partial manifestation of Himself to men. And yet Tertullian meant so very much more by this phrase, "figure of [our Lord's] body," than the empty symbol, the poor and powerless picture, which modern theologians have commonly meant by "figure," that he is able to say in the very same breath these two seemingly contradictory things, that our Lord made this bread to be His own body, and that when He said, "This is My body," He meant, "This is the figure of My body." [2]

[1] *Adv. Marcion.*, IV. 40; *P. L.* 2, 491, 492.

[2] It will be claimed by some of those theologians to whom I feel myself to be nearest, and of whose devout thoughts I am most tender, that I am here making an unhappy mistake. "We hold," they will say, "as truly as Tertullian did, that the hallowed bread is a figure of

It is necessary to take note of some utterances of Tertullian which might be urged by objectors as inconsistent with the line of thought which is here ascribed to him. Thus he is quoted as referring to our Lord's body as present *in* the bread, and His blood as present *in* the wine of the Holy Eucharist. One such passage is found in Chapter 6 of the Treatise *De Oratione:*

"In bread is understood His body." [1]

I would remark that Tertullian is here commenting on the phrase, "Give us this day our daily bread," in the Lord's Prayer. He reminds us that Christ is called "the Bread of Life." Then he adds that "in bread too is understood His body." It is just such a use of "in" as when one says, "We may see in Napoleon an instrument of God's wrath against the nations." It is a phrase of identity. Only so will it be consistent with Tertullian's more ordinary speech.

Another example of this use of "in" is found in Book IV, Chapter 40, of the *Adversus Marcionem,* from which a quotation has been made above, where Tertullian is commenting on Gen. xlix. 11, — "He washed His garments

our Lord's body, but we utterly disown the interpretation that you put upon Tertullian's phrase." I must press upon them, then, to make my point clear, that they do not hold, in any such way as Tertullian did, that the hallowed bread *is* our Lord's body. They hold that the Sacrament consists of two parts, an earthly and a heavenly, — bread and our Lord's body. They do not hold that the earthly part *is* the *heavenly part,* and Tertullian *did* hold that the earthly part is made to be the body of the Lord. Distinguishing, as I seem to find that Tertullian did distinguish, between the natural body of our Lord and His sacramental body, he could say, with perfect naturalness, either "He made bread to be His own body (sacramental)," or "This is My body (sacramental), that is, the figure of My body (natural)." Tertullian's use of "figure" will be considered further in Note E, p. 252.

[1] *P. L.* 1, 1160.

in wine, and His clothes in the blood of grapes." Here our author says, certainly, "He consecrated His blood in wine"; but let it be observed how the sentence continues, — "who then figured forth wine in blood." It is the "in" of identity in both cases.[1]

It remains that earlier in this same chapter of the *Adv. Marcion.* Tertullian, arguing for the reality of our Lord's body against Docetic notions, uses these words:

"Mentioning the cup, and making the Testament to be sealed in His blood, He affirms the reality of His body. For there cannot be blood of any body, which is not a body of flesh. If any sort of body were presented to our view, which is not one of flesh, not being fleshly, it would not possess blood. Thus from the evidence of the flesh, we get a proof of the body, and from the evidence of the blood, a proof of the flesh. In order, however, that you may discover how anciently wine is used as a figure for blood, turn to Isaiah, who asks, 'Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah?'"

"There cannot be blood of any body which is not a body of flesh." Certainly not. But Tertullian was here thinking of our Lord's natural body, and of bodies in the natural order. If Tertullian held the view which this Lecture ascribes to him, he would not have regarded the blood of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist as "blood of a body." But like S. Irenaeus, he would argue that if wine could be truly a figure of our Lord's blood, then our

[1] Compare also the immediately preceding context. "In His garments and clothes the prophecy pointed out His flesh, and His blood in the wine. Thus did He now consecrate His blood in wine." The "in" of identity appears in the former sentence in both its clauses, — "in His garments," "in the wine." The same use of "in" is found in the second clause of the other sentence, — "figured forth wine in blood." It seems a particularly natural supposition that Tertullian was using the word "in" with just the same shade of meaning in the clause which comes between.

Lord must have had real blood (in the ordinary, natural use of words), and if He had real (natural) blood, He must have had a real (natural) body. When Tertullian wrote that "from the evidence of the flesh we get a proof of the body," or (as Dr. Pusey prefers to render the words) that "the proof of a body consisteth in the testimony as to flesh," he would have been very much astonished, if some one had charged him with saying that the Church could not be called our Lord's body, not being a body of flesh and blood, or with making out that our Lord's body mystical, or (I may add) His body sacramental, must necessarily be a body of flesh and blood.

IV

S. Cyprian, of Carthage, Archbishop and Martyr (*circa* A.D. 250)

We pass on to S. Cyprian, half a century later. His writings are rich in expressions of his intense conviction that the sacramental elements were things of great and mysterious power. No Virtualist theory can tolerate S. Cyprian, nor S. Cyprian any Virtualist theory. I will not multiply quotations for so simple a point as that. It will be sufficient to refer to the stories which he tells of persons who in one way or another profaned the Sacrament. They are all found in Chapter 16 of his treatise *De Lapsis* ("On those who fell away in the time of Persecution").[1] There is the case of an infant who had been taken by her nurse, and made to take part in an idol sacrifice, and was later brought to the Church by her parents, and communicated by a deacon from the chalice. "There followed a sobbing and a vomiting. The Eucha-

[1] *P. L.* 4, 499–501.

rist was not able to remain in a body and mouth that had been polluted. The draught which had been consecrated in the blood of the Lord made its way from a mouth which had been desecrated. So great is the power of the Lord, so great His majesty." Again, a grown woman who had sacrificed to idols, "introduced herself secretly, while we were sacrificing," Cyprian says. She essayed to make her Communion, and "found not food, but a sword," falling into convulsions and suffering agonies of pain. A man who had thus fallen presented himself to receive the Lord's body, and opening his hand found there only a cinder. "Thus it was shown by the example of one, that the Lord withdraws when He is denied." A woman went to open the box in which she was keeping a portion of the reserved Sacrament, and fire rising from within the box frightened her away. Certainly, Cyprian held that the consecrated elements were great, mysterious, and full of awful power.

But there is very little indication in Cyprian's writings of what he conceived to be the nature of that sacramental power, or, in other words, what he thought those great words, "the body and blood of our Lord," to mean. Like his master Tertullian, he is emphatic in identifying the consecrated bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ. Thus he says (in Epistle 62, §4):[1]

"Who is more a priest of the Most High God than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered sacrifice to God the Father, and offered that same which Melchizedek had offered, that is, bread and wine, namely, His own body and blood?"

It will be observed that, so far from holding that no bread and wine remain in the Christian Eucharist, S. Cyprian says that our Lord offered bread and wine as

[1] *P. L.* 4, 387.

His sacrifice. If He only *appeared* to offer bread and wine, He did not offer "that same which Melchizedek had offered." It should be observed, too, that the identification of the earthly part with our Lord's body is very direct, — "bread and wine, namely, His own body and blood." I venture to claim S. Cyprian as one of those who thought of the Lord's body sacramental as at once the same as, and yet different from, the body natural in glory. It may be recalled, also, that when he was speaking of the withdrawal of the Heavenly Part of the Sacrament, as I quoted him above, he did not say, "The body of the Lord is withdrawn," but "*the Lord* withdraws, when He is denied." Not "the Lord's body," or "the Lord's blood," but "the Lord Himself" is the "Heavenly Part" of the Sacrament. The use of this particular language at this point may have been accidental. That is to say, a modern theologian might have written the same thing. But it fits in very exactly with the course of thought which I have been ascribing to the primitive Church.

Also, I note that S. Cyprian does not speak like modern theologians of the body of our Lord being present "*in*" the eucharistic bread. Dr. Pusey claims him among patristic authorities for that sort of phrase, which Dr. Pusey valued as opposing the opinion of Transubstantiation. His careful scrutiny could find but ten writers within the space of the first five centuries, to whom such language could be ascribed. The examples from Tertullian do not seem to prove his point, and those from Cyprian are confined to cases where the martyr speaks of our Lord's "*blood*," and speaks of it as being "in the *cup*."

Dr. Pusey claims broadly that "'the cup' in the Fathers is altogether equivalent to the element of 'wine,' so that

'the cup' stands for the one element as much as 'the bread' for the other." Certainly, "the cup" is often so used, but Dr. Pusey's own quotations from S. Cyprian show that this point must not be pressed. So far from "the cup" being "altogether equivalent to the element of wine," there are manifold examples where "the cup" must mean "the chalice," quite literally. Thus, in a later section of the Letter last quoted (*Ep.* 62, §6),[1] S. Cyprian writes:

"When the blood of grapes is mentioned, what else is shown than the wine of the cup of the blood of the Lord?"

Certainly, "the wine of the cup" is not to be taken as equivalent to "the wine of the wine." When, then, S. Cyprian goes on in the same section with these words, —

"Mention is therefore made of wine that the blood of the Lord may be understood, and what was afterwards manifested in the cup of the Lord might be foreshown in the predictions of the prophets,"

we may understand "what was manifested in the cup of the Lord" to mean "what was manifested in the chalice." [2]

There remains one more passage of S. Cyprian which I must quote. It is from section 9 of his Letter 62, and in it he is arguing from the words of distribution:

"Wherein we find that the cup which the Lord offered was mixed, and that that was wine which He called His blood.

[1] *P. L.* 4, 389.

[2] The phrase, "Mention is made of wine that the blood of the Lord may be understood" suggests Tertullian's "In bread is understood His body," and both passages suggest that somehow the use of these words "body" and "blood" in connection with the Holy Eucharist is an exceptional use, a use depending upon a particular understanding, a use not according to men's common speech.

Whence it is apparent that the blood of Christ is not offered, if there be no wine in the cup."

This is another example of the use of "the cup" by S. Cyprian as meaning distinctly "the chalice." I offer it chiefly because of the phrase, — "the wine which He called His blood." Roman theology demands such a phrase as "wine which He turned to be His blood." The Oxford School calls for "wine in which He made His blood to dwell as within a veil." Either theology can represent our Lord as calling *what He offers us in the chalice* His blood. Neither theology really calls *wine* "our Lord's blood," nor thinks of our Lord as doing so. S. Cyprian gazed upon the consecrated wine, and called that element "our Lord's blood," believing that he was following the word of revelation of our Lord Himself.

C. *North Italy, and the Testimony of S. Ambrose and the Author of the Book* De Sacramentis

I return to Italy again. The only Roman theologian of note who appears between the time of S. Irenaeus and the end of the fourth century is S. Hippolytus. I find nothing of his that throws any light upon our present questions, and we must pass directly to the testimony of S. Ambrose,[1] and the author of the treatise *De Sacramentis.*

In approaching this testimony I take leave to remind you once more of the difference which I seem to find between the eucharistic pre-suppositions of the Fathers

[1] A great Gallican theologian is here passed over, — S. Hilary, Bp. of Poictiers. He refers largely and eloquently to the subject of the Holy Eucharist, but I find nothing in his language which might not be used as the expression of any high view of the Sacrament. For his use of "*sub sacramento*" see Note A, p. 233.

and those of modern theologians. The modern student cannot see the phrase "the body of the Lord" without thinking of our Lord's glorified body in heaven, unless he knows that the mystical body, the Church, is in question. The Fathers understood (so, at least, I am maintaining) that the bread of the Eucharist was "the body of our Lord" in some special sense, even as the Church was "the body of our Lord," in some special sense, differentiated from His natural body. Hence comes this deeply marked difference, that the modern theologian who holds high views of the Sacrament has to distinguish between the bread of the Eucharist and the body of the Lord. The bread is to him the earthly part, and the body of our Lord is the heavenly part. But the early writers identified the bread and the body. They held that the bread, the earthly part of the Sacrament, receiving the addition of the heavenly part, became thus our Lord's body. The modern writer explains how the bread may be *called* "the body of our Lord," but has to acknowledge that it cannot be called so in strictness of speech. The early writers used constantly the language which the moderns declare that they cannot in strictness use, and they never use the language which some moderns consider strictly accurate, at all. I mean that no ancient writer, so far as I am aware, ever speaks of our Lord's body as *present in the bread.* I shall examine the instances of such use alleged by Dr. Pusey in a supplemental note (see p. 233). The early writers absolutely identify "the bread" and "the body of the Lord," whereas modern theology is in the habit of distinguishing them.

V

S. Ambrose, of Milan, Abp. (*circa* A.D. 380)

A striking example of this identification is found in these words of S. Ambrose:

"So often as we receive the sacraments which by the mystery of the holy prayer are transfigured into flesh and blood, we show forth the death of the Lord." [1]

This passage is alleged by Roman theologians to show that S. Ambrose held the theory of Transubstantiation. It is an unfortunate selection for that purpose. As Dr. Pusey points out (pp. 230, 231), readers of S. Ambrose found this word *transfigurari* in their Latin version of the Holy Scriptures, where it was used of the "transfiguration" of our Lord (S. Matt. xvii. 2), of Satan's being "transfigured into an angel of light," of the ministers of Satan being "transfigured as ministers of righteousness," of false Apostles "transfiguring themselves into Apostles of Christ" (2 Cor. xi. 13–15). In every one of these cases the thing transfigured remains *substantially as it was before*. And Dr. Pusey quotes aptly Tertullian's argument (in the *De Resurrectione Carnis*, 55) [2] to show that the changing of our bodies does not mean the loss of our bodies. Tertullian quotes the passage "who shall transfigure (so he read in Phil. iii. 21) the body of our humiliation," and goes on thus:

"If you maintain that a transfiguration and a conversion amounts to the annihilation of any substance, then it follows that Saul, when 'changed into another man,' passed away from his own bodily substance, and that Satan himself, when 'transfigured into an angel of light,' loses his own proper character. So like-

[1] *De Fide* IV, 125; *P. L.* 16, 64. [2] *P. L.* 2, 925.

wise changes, conversions, and reformations will necessarily take place to bring about the resurrection, but the substance of the flesh will be preserved safe." [1]

No! Certainly, S. Ambrose does not imply any disappearance of the elements, but the contrary. In view of the passages of Scripture which have been referred to as containing this word "transfigured," I suggest that it may have had in the mind of S. Ambrose the idea of "putting on some novel glory." It might be a real acquisition, as with the Transfiguration of our Lord, and as with the resurrection of God's people. It might be a false assumption, as with Satan or the false Apostles. In the case which S. Ambrose has in hand, it is, of course, a real glorification. But does S. Ambrose mean that the elements are glorified by *receiving* our Lord's body and blood? That could be called a "transfiguring" of the elements, I am sure. But S. Ambrose does not say that thing. He says that the elements are "transfigured *into* flesh and blood." They receive a new glory, and that glory gives them this new character. They *are*, not merely *contain*, the body and blood of Christ.

Dr. Pusey quotes from S. Ambrose (*De Mysteriis*, Chapter 9) [2] a passage far too long to be given here. Chapter 8 had closed with the words, — "Light is better than shadow, truth than figure, the body of the Author than manna from heaven."

[1] It should be acknowledged that Tertullian has another passage (*Adv. Praxeam*, 27) in which he says just the opposite: "Whatsoever is transfigured into some other thing ceases to be that which it had been, and begins to be that which it previously was not." But he gives no proof for this judgment, as he does for the opposite one.

[2] *P. L.* 16, 409.

Then Chapter 9 begins thus:

"Perhaps you will say, 'I see something else; how is it that you assert that I receive the body of Christ?' . . . Let us prove that this is not what nature made, but what the blessing consecrated, and the power of blessing is greater than that of nature, because by blessing nature itself is changed."

He proceeds to give examples of the power of God to change natures: Moses' rod changed to a serpent, the rivers of Egypt turned to blood, the Red Sea parting, Jordan driven back, the iron made to swim at the prayer of Elisha. It will be observed that in most of these cases the old nature remains, and the miracle is a miracle of added qualities or powers. But all these were miracles wrought by prophets, by mere men. The miracle of the altar is wrought by the word of One who is God.

"If the word of Elijah had such power as to bring down fire from heaven, shall not the word of Christ have power to change the nature (*species*) of the elements? You have read concerning the making of the whole world, 'He spake, and they were made: He commanded, and they were created.' Shall not the word of Christ, which was able to make out of nothing that which (formerly) was not, be able to change things which already are into that which they were not? For giving a new nature to things is not an inferior accomplishment to changing them."

"To change the nature of the elements," "change things which already are into that which they were not." The Roman teaching does not fit with S. Ambrose, for his "transfiguring" leaves the elements still in existence. The teaching of the Oxford School does not fit with S. Ambrose, for it acknowledges no change in the nature of the elements themselves, whereby they become in some sense our Lord's body and blood, but claims that the elements are called our Lord's body and blood to show

that our Lord's body and blood are really there *without change in the elements*. But let us go on with the words of S. Ambrose:

"But why use arguments? Let us use the examples that He gives, and prove the truth of the Mystery by the example of the Incarnation. Did the course of nature proceed as usual, when the Lord Jesus was born of Mary? If we look to the usual course, a woman ordinarily conceives when she has had intercourse with a man. And this body which we make is that which was born of the Virgin. Why do you seek the order of nature in the body of Christ, seeing that the Lord Jesus Himself was born of a virgin, not according to nature? It was the true flesh of Christ which was crucified and buried; in truth, then, stands the sacrament of His flesh. The Lord Jesus Himself proclaims, 'This is My body.' Before the blessing of the heavenly words another nature is spoken of; after the consecration the body is signified. He Himself speaks of His blood. Before the consecration it has another name; after it is called blood. And you say, 'Amen,' that is, 'It is true.' What the mouth utters, let the heart within confess. What the voice speaks, let the soul feel."

I must comment briefly on three of these phrases. First, there is that strange-sounding clause, "In truth, then, stands the sacrament of His flesh." I take it that those words are meant to signify that "the sacrament of our Lord's flesh," the bread consecrated to be His body, belongs to the domain of reality. Our Lord's natural flesh is real, not phantasmal; the *sacrament* of His flesh, the bread called His body, has a real right to the name. Next, I note that S. Ambrose distinctly says that "the body which we make," in the act of consecration, "is that which was born of the Virgin." I accept that saying *ex animo*. I hold that our Lord so takes to Himself for a body the bread of our Eucharist that it becomes

an extension of His body natural, a part of that body natural, and so one with it, that we may truly say just such a thing as this, — "The body of the Eucharist, the consecrated bread, is the body which was born in Bethlehem." I claim that the words of S. Ambrose are patient of such an interpretation. The subject of the identity of the eucharistic body and the body in heaven will come up again, to be dealt with more fully. Meanwhile, I ask attention to still another phrase, — "the sacrament of His flesh." I seem to find S. Ambrose using that form of words to point to the bread as being our Lord's "flesh" in a sacramental sense, as distinguished from the flesh in the natural sense. And this notion I find confirmed a moment later by that phrase used of the wine, — "It is called blood." "The body is signified" is ambiguous. It might mean, either "the bread is in a sense our Lord's body," or "the body of the Lord is shown to be present in the bread." But "it is called blood" refers plainly to the wine. I feel sure that according to the theology of S. Ambrose the earthly element deserved that name.

VI

The Author of the Book, *De Sacramentis;* North Italy (before A.D. 400)

We turn to the Treatise, *De Sacramentis.* The author is unknown, but it has been made out clearly that he was a bishop in North Italy, perhaps a pupil, certainly an admirer and imitator, of S. Ambrose, and of but little later date. He is really another witness as to the kind of teaching that S. Ambrose used to give. I take some passages from his Fourth Book, Cap. iv. Sections 14–23.[1]

[1] *P. L.* 16, 439–444.

"14. You say, perhaps, 'My bread is common bread.' But that bread is bread before the words of the sacraments; when the consecration has taken place, from being bread it becomes the flesh of Christ. Let us then declare this. How can that which is bread be the body of Christ? By consecration."

"How can that which is bread be the body of Christ?" Our author here has a chance to explain that it is not really so, but is called so because the body of Christ is there behind its veil. But he does not say that. He does not think it. He holds that this very bread has by the consecration become a greater thing. For hear how he goes on in Section 15:

"If then there is such power in the word of the Lord Jesus that those things which were not should begin to be, how much more does it bring to pass that those things which were should still be, and should also be changed into something else. . . . Before consecration it was not the body of Christ; but after consecration, I tell you that now it is the body of Christ. 'He spake, and it was made: He commanded, and it was created.'

You were yourself, but you were an old creature; after you were consecrated, you began to be a new creature. Do you wish to know how a new creature? 'Every one,' says the Scripture, 'in Christ is a new creature.'"

You see how distinctly it is the doctrine of this author, as of his master, S. Ambrose, that the elements continue in being, and that they are also changed so as to be something else. And he hints, at least, at the nature of the change. He tells the Christian enquirer, who is asking "How can these things be?" to consider his own case. Once he was an old creature, and lost; now since his Baptism, *his* "consecration," he is a new creature, and saved. What has made the difference? Of course, the pupil will bethink himself that it is the indwelling life of

Christ the Saviour, given him in his Baptism, that makes him a new creature. That indwelling of our Lord's life is what changes a man into a Christian. Our author seems to have had a similar thought as to the mystery of the change of our bread and wine into the body and blood of our Lord. Yet the same author who is sure that the elements are in some sense our Lord's body and blood will also freely speak of them as figures, or likenesses, of our Lord's (natural) body and blood. In Section 20 he speaks thus:

"But haply thou sayest, I do not see the form (*speciem*) of blood! No! but it hath a likeness. For as thou hast received a likeness of death,[1] so also thou drinkest a likeness of the precious blood, that there may be no horror at gore, and that none the less the price of redemption may accomplish its work. You have learnt, then, that what you receive is the body of Christ."

In Chapter 21 occurs a quotation from the Liturgy in use in Northern Italy in the author's time:

"Wouldest thou know that it is consecrated by heavenly words? Hear what the words are. The priest says, 'Make this oblation for us availing, valid, reasonable, acceptable, because it is the figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.'"

Our writer speaks of the Eucharist as consecrated "by the words" given above. It is only fair to add that he is quoted as holding the idea that consecration was effected by the recital of our Lord's words, "This is My body," "This is My blood." "When the words of Christ have operated," he says, "there is made the blood

[1] The reference is to Romans vi. 5, — "If we were united with Him in the likeness of His death," — and it is interesting to see how our author looks again to the Sacrament of Baptism for an analogy to the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

of Christ" (Chapter 23). But in view of the distinct statement of the writer that the consecration is effected by the words of the *Liturgy*, given above, it seems to be worthy of enquiry whether his phrase, "When the words of Christ have operated," may not be meant, as S. Chrysostom's great phrase about our Lord's Voice *re-ordering* the elements seems to have been meant, to refer to an abiding efficacy of our Lord's words spoken in the upper room. The phrase of S. Chrysostom is examined in Note G, p. 258.

I must call attention briefly to the phrase of S. Ambrose, "This body which we make" (p. 53), and to the phrase of his follower, "There is made the blood of Christ." We shall find similar language used by S. Jerome in the next generation. I submit that according to this doctrine the body of Christ in the Eucharist is a body that can be made. His body in heaven is a body which cannot be made by man.

Dr. Pusey, on page 285 of his monumental book, makes the strange mistake of translating the words "*ibi sanguis Christi efficitur*," "the blood of Christ is made to be there." This would certainly require *efficitur ut ibi sit.* The same passage is rightly rendered on Dr. Pusey's page 106.

LECTURE III

THE USE OF FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE IN HOLY SCRIPTURE, AND THE TESTIMONY OF THE ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL

IF there is any one thing that is more shocking, more utterly repellent, than another, to most students who have been accustomed to take high views of the Eucharistic Mystery, it is the suggestion that our Lord's words, "This is My body," "This is My blood," are to be taken figuratively. To say, "Oh! That is a figurative expression!" is the common refuge of shallow theologians when they meet with a mysterious saying which offers them more than they are ready to receive. Alas! They show by their language, and by their behaviour, that "a figurative expression" is to them an expression that means very little, or nothing at all. I have put forth a suggestion that the writers of the primitive Church were in the habit of taking our Lord's great words above recited as figurative. I expose my study to such a bitterness of prejudice by that acknowledgment that I am bound to take time for some observations on the use of figurative language in Divine Revelation.

There is a great deal of it. Figurative language occurs not only in the meditations of saints, as in Psalm lxxxiv., "The LORD God is a sun and a shield," where it certainly means much, and not little, but also in the communication of new truths to the people of God. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the

Word was God" (S. John i. 1). Certainly, that great title of "the Word" for the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity is a figurative expression. Certainly, also, it means a great deal, and we are expected to study it reverently, and, with the help of God, draw out the meaning. "This is My beloved Son" (S. Matt. xvii. 5) is a figurative expression. It confirms from heaven what S. Peter had been saying, a few days before, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (S. Matt. xvi. 16). In that confession of S. Peter there are two figurative expressions, *Christ*, which stands for "Anointed," and *Son*. None of us could be guilty of the folly of supposing that these expressions, as being figurative, were of small significance. *Word* and *Christ* and *Son!* These words carry tremendous meaning, every one of them. One may say that our Lord was *really* "the Son of God," and was really "the Lord's Anointed," — "anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power." Surely. But it remains that that "Sonship" is figurative, not literal, and that "anointing" is figurative, not literal. Our deep sense that these figurative expressions used in regard to our Lord stand for realities, and magnificent realities, must not make us forget the fact that God tells us these great things by the method of parable. Here, then, is my first point about the figurative language of Holy Scripture. God, seeking to convey to us such an idea as we can receive of the greatest facts, the most fundamental realities, of the universe, does habitually use the language of figure.

But I must go farther. God has made His material world full of pictures — of parables, so to speak, — of spiritual facts. The Divine mind loves to contemplate such pictures, and dwell upon them, and to use them in bringing material beings to a vision of spiritual truths.

And more than that, God teaches His people to look through the picture to the spiritual reality which the picture somehow represents, and find the spiritual reality greater, and more splendidly real, than the earthly counterpart. Bread is a natural figure for anything which supplies nourishment to the world. It is a picture therefore, of our Lord supplying nourishment for the whole world. But the fact of our Lord as the nourishment of a needy world is so much greater than the fact of our earthly bread as the nourishment of a needy world, that our Lord speaks of Himself as "the true [the *genuine*] bread out of heaven" (S. John vi. 32), the only "bread" that is really worthy of the name. And so our Lord describes Himself as "the true [the *genuine*] vine," (S. John xv. 1). "Vine" is a figurative title for Him, but He fulfils the idea which the vine was put into the world to represent, more fully and finely and nobly than any natural vine that God ever made. Not only, then, is the use of figurative language for the expression of the greatest spiritual realities one of the habits of the Mind of God, but when God does that thing, His spiritual fact is more real, not less, than the literal meaning of the words which He borrows out of our halting speech.

If, then, I ascribe to the Fathers of the Church a habit of regarding as figurative our Lord's words about giving His body and His blood in the Eucharist, I do not for a moment mean to charge the Fathers with representing those consecrated elements as mere pictures — distant, ineffective, unreal pictures — of heavenly powers. Plainly, they thought those elements to have become inexpressibly great. They did not think that the broken bread was a mere picture of our Lord's broken body, nor the poured wine a mere picture of our Lord's shed blood. My brethren who follow the teachings of the

Oxford School *do* make the consecrated bread and wine to be the merest figures. They hold that Heavenly Realities are present there, under the veils of bread and wine, but they hold the bread and wine themselves to be but pictures, mere "figures of the true." [1] The Fathers of old time, if I understand them, took our Lord's words in another way. "Words in His language," they might have said, "mean always more than the corresponding words in our language. If He says that our eucharistic bread is His body, then it is something greater than even His natural body of flesh and bones. If He says that the wine of our Eucharist is His blood, then He means something greater than even the blood that was in His veins on that night in the upper room. Through the body of His flesh He touched the world in which He lived with blessing, but when He takes the bread of the Eucharist for a body, He touches a vaster world than that little world of Galilee and Judea, and wheresoever He touches, He blesses. He heals the diseased, He makes the blind see and the deaf hear, He raises the dead to newness of life. Greater than even the body of His flesh is the body of our Lord's bread." To call our Lord's language "figurative" in *such* a meaning is *not* to make its meaning poor and small.

[1] Theologians of the Oxford School are scornful of the idea that our Lord's words can be taken figuratively. They regard themselves as absolute literalists, because they take the word "This" as referring to the Heavenly Reality, and not to the earthly element at all. Grant them such a reference of the word "This" in our Lord's words of distribution, and they *are* literalists as regards the word "body" and the word "blood." But when they have to explain the language of the Fathers, who say unhesitatingly that the *bread* is our Lord's body, they resort at once to an explanation of *that* language, which is figurative in the lowest order of figurative speech. S. Augustine's much-quoted phrase about Sacraments having "a likeness to those things of which they are Sacraments" will be considered in Lecture V, p. 134.

My particular reason for bringing in this subject of figurative language just here is that the great theological school of Alexandria maintained for several generations a tradition of particular sympathy with our Lord's mind on that side of its working. Those who love figures of speech and find it natural to use them in their own teaching can find, I am sure, more readily than the born literalist, the real meaning which the great users of figurative language intended by their language to convey. Are there scholars who are still under the delusion that what is really meant by a figurative expression is any less real than what is meant by a literal expression, as if our Lord, the True Vine, the Genuine Vine,[1] was less real as a vine than some common vine that bears grapes in a vineyard? Then for the benefit of such it may be worth while to observe that in the Arian Controversy the figure-loving, mystical school of Alexandria was a pillar of orthodoxy, as against the contentions of the more literal-minded school of Antioch, which was always a fruitful mother of heresies. Arius, who was entirely a son of Antioch, though he came to Alexandria to take charge of a wealthy and worldly congregation, and found a field to preach his heresy there, pressed upon men what he called the necessary consequences of the word "Son," just as in the last thousand years a long line of well-meaning theologians have been pressing what they thought to be the necessary consequences of our Lord's words

[1] Our Lord's word ἀληθινός seems to be used to mean that that to which a certain title is now applied is more truly worthy of the title than anything else to which the title is applied. "I am the True Vine" might well be rendered, "I am the *Real* Vine." So far is the figurative from having in it any element of the unreal in the language of Him who is the Truth. For the use of ἀληθινός compare Trench's *Synonyms of the N. T.*, pp. 25–29.

about His body and blood. Arius insisted, for example, that a "son" could not be as old as his father. He declared that it was impossible — if he had been writing as an English theologian for to-day, he would doubtless have said that it was not merely *supra naturam*, but *contra naturam*, and therefore utterly incredible — that a "son" should receive the whole substance of His father. Arius foamed at the mouth because the "orthodox," like Athanasius, reduced (as he thought) words of Divine Revelation to empty figures, and evacuated them of their natural meaning. But we can see now that Athanasius was right. Arius, taking words of God in what seemed to him a more real sense, was simply contending for a reality that was not there. Athanasius, so unjustly charged with weakening certain great words of God, and depriving them of something of their natural suggestion, was really holding to the sense of God in those same words, and to what had always been the supernatural intention of them. If God uses words figuratively, you will make no gain of reality by taking them literally. And God does love the figurative use of words.

I

S. Clement, of Alexandria, Doctor of Theology (A.D. 190–203)

I pass to the examination of the language used by Alexandrian writers concerning the Eucharistic Mystery, and the first that comes before us is the presbyter Clement, long the head of the great catechetical school of that city. His language is highly figurative, and sometimes very obscure, but I think that he makes some points quite clear. One is that he held the phrase, "the blood of our Lord," to have two meanings, one natural, one sacra-

mental. My quotation begins near the beginning of Book II, Chapter 2, of the *Paedagogus* (Potter's Edition, p. 177).[1]

"Two fold," he says, "is the blood of the Lord. The one is His natural blood, by which we have been saved from destruction, the other spiritual,[2] i. e., wherewith we are anointed. To drink the blood of Jesus is to partake of the Lord's immortality."

I should say that plainly his thought was that the wine of our Eucharist is called "the blood of our Lord" figuratively, because it is made to be the vehicle of His immortal life, which is communicated to us thereby.

"But the Spirit is the strength of the Word, as blood of flesh. As the wine is mixed with water, so is the Spirit with the man. And the one, the mixture, nourishes to faith, and the other, the Spirit, guides to immortality. And the mingling of both, of the drink and the Word, is called Eucharist, a grace renowned and glorious, and those who partake of it in faith are sanctified in both body and soul, the will of the Father mingling together mystically the divine mixture, man, with the Spirit and the Word.[3] For

[1] *P. G.* 8, 409.

[2] It is necessary to urge upon modern readers that to S. Clement and the men of his day the word "spiritual" had no such connotation of "immaterial" as the word has unfortunately had thrust upon it in modern times. That most unhappy mistake by which S. Paul was made to appear to English readers as setting a "spiritual" body over against a "natural" body, where the latter should have been called a "psychic" body, a phrase which nobody would have understood, and nobody could have been deluded into *thinking* that he understood, while he was getting the idea all wrong, — that pitiful mistake in translation, I say, has worked havoc in the modern mind, giving to the word "spiritual" the senses of "non-material," and (alas!) "*un-real.*" To S. Clement an earthly element of a sacrament was a "spiritual" thing, and a tremendous reality.

[3] Several translations of this sentence read "by the Spirit and the Word." The Greek case (the Dative) will not admit the idea of Per-

in truth the Spirit is joined to the soul that is moved by it, and the flesh, for the sake of which the Word was made flesh, to the Word."

I seem to find here, not the thought that the joining of our Lord's natural flesh and blood to the eucharistic elements makes the Sacrament, but rather the thought that the joining of the Spirit and the Word to bread and wine makes that bread and wine to be a body and blood of our Lord. The same thought comes out near the end of the same chapter (Potter's *Clement*, p. 186),[1] where he says,

"He blessed wine, saying, 'Take, drink; this is my blood,' [when it was] blood of the grape. For in a figure He sets forth (ἀλληγορεῖ) the Word which 'is shed for many for the remission of sins', as a holy stream of gladness."

Dr. Pusey advances this passage to show that S. Clement held that the wine was still wine after the Consecration. It stands good for that purpose, but it stands good also to show that Clement thought that it was wine which our Lord meant when He said, "This is My blood," — wine, and not the natural blood of His own veins. A like saying is found in the sixth chapter of Book I of the *Paedagogus* (the pages in Potter's edition are 123, 124):[2]

"The Holy Ghost makes of flesh a parable (ἀλληγορεῖ) for us, for by Him hath the flesh been created. Blood figures (αἰνίττεται) for us the Word, for as rich blood the Word hath been poured into our life."

Returning to the beginning of the chapter (II. 2) which I have quoted earlier, we have this strange-sounding phrase:

sonal Agency. It must be translated "by means of" (as of a mere instrumentality) or "with." The sentence following shows that "with" was S. Clement's thought.

[1] *P. G.* 8, 428.

[2] *P. G.* 8, 301.

"The mystic symbol of the holy blood the Scripture hath called wine."

Again we have a given element called "the blood" of our Lord and a "mystic symbol" of His blood. The explanation offered by S. Clement is, "The blood of the Lord is two fold." The wine of our Eucharist is made to be a sacramental, or as S. Clement likes to say, a "spiritual," blood; it is a symbol of our Lord's natural blood.

II

Theodotus, Heretic (last part of second century)

I follow Dr. Pusey in adding here a quotation from a heretical writer, Theodotus, who was a contemporary of Clement of Alexandria. His doctrine of the Eucharist would seem to have been just that of the Catholic Church. This passage is noteworthy as bringing together, as if they were quite analogous, three sacramental consecrations, — that of the bread of the Eucharist, that of the oil of Confirmation, and that of the water of Baptism.

"And the bread and the oil are sanctified by the power of the Name, not being, as they appear, the same as they were taken, but *by power they are changed into a spiritual power.* In like manner, the water, too, both that which is exorcised, and that which becometh Baptism, not only contains what is inferior, but also acquires sanctifying."[1]

[1] The passage is in the *Patrologia Graeca* 9, col. 696. The Greek phrase is τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ ἐξορκιζόμενον καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα γινόμενον cannot be translated rightly, "The water which is exorcized and becometh Baptism." Theodotus, using καὶ . . . καὶ, plainly distinguishes two waters, a lustral holy water, and the water of Baptism. Cf. article Holy Water in *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.* The water of *exorcism* may have been at that time a Gnostic peculiarity. It is not mentioned so early by any Catholic writer.

I venture to remark that all the early writers thought thus of sacramental elements as changed into spiritual powers. According to most modern theories the elements of bread and wine are not themselves spiritual powers at all. They only provide a spiritual power with a local habitation which it does not locally inhabit.

III

Origen, Greatest Teacher of the Third Century (A.D. 203–253)

We pass to the testimony of that very great man, Origen. Just because he was a great man, he often had thoughts hard for common men to understand, but he was a devoted, and most devout, student, a deeply loyal son of the Church in every purpose of his heart, and a man who drew out an almost unbounded admiration and personal devotion from men (some of them really great men in their time) who were his personal pupils. He was the object of severe criticism, and of some ecclesiastical condemnations, but so far as I am aware, no one ever faulted him as misrepresenting the Church's doctrine of the Eucharist. How does he represent that doctrine? To him, as to S. Clement, the eucharistic body of our Lord is a "typical and symbolical body." The passage from which I take these words is a long one occurring in his Commentary on S. Matthew, *Tom.* xi. n. 14. Origen is commenting on the words, "Not that which entereth into the mouth defileth the man" (*S. Matt.* xv. 11), and he has laid down a general principle that no holy thing can, of itself, without a holy action of the man's own soul, hallow a man, and, on the other hand, no foul thing can, of itself, without some unholy action of the man's own soul, defile a man. He presently illustrates by the Holy Eucharist.

"That which is sanctified by the Word of God and by prayer doth not of itself sanctify the receiver; for if so, it would sanctify even him who eateth unworthily the bread of the Lord, and no one would through that food become weak and sickly, or sleep. . . . And in this bread of the Lord there is profit to the receiver, when with mind undefiled and conscience pure he receiveth that bread. And so neither by not eating, simply from the not eating of the bread which is sanctified by the Word of God and by prayer, do we lose any good, nor by eating do we gain any good; for the cause of our loss is our wickedness and deeds of sin, and the cause of our gain is our righteousness and deeds of uprightness; for this is what is meant by Paul in the words, 'neither if we eat are we the better, neither if we eat not are we the worse.' And if 'whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught,' and the food which is consecrated by the Word of God and by prayer, so far as regards the material part, goes into the belly, and is cast out into the draught, but so far as regards the prayer which cometh upon it, according to the proportion of the faith, becomes beneficial, and the cause of the mind's perception, as it looks to that which is beneficial, then not the matter of the bread, but the word spoken over it, is that which benefiteth him who eateth it, not unworthily of the Lord. And this may be said of the typical and symbolical body."[1]

"The cause of our gain is our righteousness and uprightness." That is startling doctrine! But I think that what Origen *means* is *true*. He was no Pelagian, to make us men our own saviours; but he perceives that nothing from outside ourselves can save us, unless we truly give ourselves to be saved. But it is, of course, with his eucharistic doctrine that we have our chief concern, and this has in it something to give us furiously to think, as our French neighbors have a way of saying.

[1] *Origenis Opera*, Edition of De La Rue, III. 500; *P. G.* 13, coll. 948, 949, 952.

For he makes it clear that he thinks of the food of the Eucharist as subject to all the laws of human food, laws of digestion and excretion. He knows of no "material" element in the Holy Eucharist, which is *not* subject to those laws. Surely, our Lord's body in heaven, and His blood, if He has blood in heaven, which I suppose that He has not, are "material" substances, and even if they are present in the Eucharist after a spiritual manner, should be carefully excepted when one is speaking about the material part, and saying something which is not true of *them at all.* No! Plainly, Origen thought of no material part in the Eucharist except the bread and wine, and when he adds, "This is true of the typical and symbolical body," he leaves no room for us to say that he is distinguishing between this typical body, the bread, and a more real body. If it be objected that Origen may have held that our Lord's body in heaven was *not* now a material body, I will simply say, "Then grant me at least that Origen's idea of a 'typical and symbolical' body was of a body of bread which could be eaten and digested. He does not think of a symbolical body as being the identical body which it symbolizes."

For further illustration of Origen's habit of thinking of the bread of the Eucharist as being, rather than containing, our Lord's body, let me quote two passages:

"We, giving thanks to the Creator of the universe, eat the bread offered with thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστίας*) and prayer over the things offered, which bread becometh a body passing holy,[1]

[1] Dr. Pusey and Dr. Darwell Stone both translate *σῶμα ἅγιόν τι*, "a certain holy body," or "a kind of holy body," which would be a version very welcome to me, but I am bound to point out that *τι* following an adjective qualifies the adjective, and not the noun, and (as in our dialect phrases, "*some* strong," "*some* talkative," "*some* good-looking") means that the quality denoted by the adjective belongs to the subject

which halloweth those who use the same with a sound purpose."[1]

"Ye, who are wont to be present at the Divine Mysteries, know how, when ye receive the body of the Lord, ye keep it with all care and veneration, lest any particle of it fall, lest any of the consecrated gift escape you."[2]

It will, of course, be said by some that Origen was thinking of a greater and heavenly Thing, present, invisible, in a visible sacrament. But strictly there can be no such thing as a "particle" of the "heavenly body" of the Oxford School. Origen was plainly calling *bread* "the body of the Lord." I add further passages which seem to me to make it clear that Origen found in the elements a sacramental body and blood of our Lord, rather than His natural body. In one of them Origen distinguishes the blood of the flesh from the blood of the Word, and in the other he calls the body of our Lord, which is offered us in the Sacrament, His *eucharistic* body.

"But thou, who hast come to Christ, the true High Priest, who by His own blood hath made God propitious to thee, and reconciled thee to the Father, stop not at the blood of the flesh, but learn rather the blood of the Word, and hear Himself saying to thee, 'This is My blood, which is shed for you for the remission of sins.' He who is imbued with the Mysteries knoweth the flesh and blood of the 'Word of God.'"[3]

"Therefore further on in the Psalm, hinting at the mystical food, as it seems, He said, 'Taste, and see that the Lord is good.' Perchance exhorting to taste Christ Himself, he hinted by these

in an indefinite, that is an unmeasured, an immeasurable, way. "A certain holy body" would require *σῶμά τι ἅγιον*. See further in Note F, p. 256.

[1] *Contra Celsum*, 8, 33; *P. G.* 11, 1565.

[2] *In Exodum.* Hom. xiii. 3; *P. G.* 12, 391.

[3] *In Levit.*, Hom. ix. 10; *P. G.* 12, 523.

words at His body, whereof there was a symbol in the Law, *the eucharistic body* of Christ succeeding the shew-bread." [1]

A greater symbol, the eucharistic body, succeeding a lesser symbol, the shew-bread, seems to be the connection of thought.

But it may be said that Origen has a passage in which he says expressly that our Lord *did not* call bread His body, and *did not* call wine His blood. That would not be quite accurate. Origen says, "Not that visible bread . . . did He call His body, but the Word, in the Mystery of which that bread was to be broken; nor did He call that visible drink His blood, but the Word, in whose Mystery that drink was to be poured out." It is a fairly familiar figure of rhetoric. We say that a man did not do one thing, but another, where every one knows that he did both, meaning that the second was vastly more important than the first. To say that a man did not do one thing, but another, in that particular sort of rhetorical figure, is an express indication that the writer regards the man as having really done that former thing. Keble's lines will be remembered:

> "Oh! come to our Communion-feast,
> Where present in the heart,
> Not in the hands, the eternal Priest
> Doth His true Self impart."

Literal-minded people persuaded the poet in later life to change "Not in the hands" to "*As* in the hands." There was not the slightest change in the poet's thought. So it was with Origen. The whole object of the Sacrament, he would say, is to make men partakers of God the eternal Word. In the ultimate meaning He is Him-

[1] *Sel. in Psalm.* Ed. De La Rue, Tom. ii, p. 520; *P. G.* 12, 1068, 1069.

self the Food of His people. You must learn to look through the Sacrament and beyond the Sacrament to the Lord Himself. In such a spirit Origen writes what Dr. Pusey calls "a passage of great difficulty":

"That bread which God the Word confesses to be His own body is the word that nourishes souls. It is the word proceeding from God the Word. It is bread from the heavenly Bread, which is placed upon that table of which it is written, 'Thou hast prepared a table before me against them that trouble me.' And that drink which God the Word confesses to be His blood is the Word that gives drink and excellent gladness to [literally, "bedeweth and inebriateth"] the hearts of those who drink, which Word is in that cup of which it is written, 'And Thy gladdening cup, how excellent it is.' And that drink is that fruit of the True Vine, which says, 'I am the True Vine.' And it is the blood [the secret of the life] of that Grape which, cast into the wine-press of the Passion, brought forth this drink. So also the bread [that which really sustains life] is the Word of Christ, made of that Seed-corn which, falling into the ground, yields much fruit. For not that visible bread which He held in His hands did the Word call His body, but the Word in the mystery of which that bread was to be broken. Nor did He call that visible drink His blood, but the Word in the mystery of which that drink was to be poured out. For what else can the body of God the Word, or His blood, be but the word which nourishes, and the word which gladdens the heart?"

I interrupt my quotation here to say that I take Origen's meaning in these last words to be something like this: Any incarnation of God *must be* an allegory. The body of God must be an allegory of His desire to touch the world. The blood of God must be an allegory of His desire to animate the world. The "body of the Lord" and the "blood of the Lord" mean in the highest view His means of doing these two things, His whole power to express

Himself and to communicate Himself. And Origen sums up all our Lord's power to express Himself and His means of expressing Himself in this one description, "*the word.*" He goes the whole length of saying in one of his Homilies on Numbers, that we "drink the blood of Christ, not only in the way of Sacraments, but when we receive His words, in which He consists" (*In Num. Hom.* vii. 5).[1] And yet to make him say that what he would call the lower meaning of the sacramental words was not literally true, would be to make him contradict himself quite hopelessly. Origen believed in a great sacramental grace that belonged to the bread and the cup of the Eucharist, and in his next following words, which seem to me to be very important, he further plainly distinguishes the one grace from the other.

"Why then did he not say, 'This is the bread of the new covenant.' Because the bread is the word of righteousness, by eating which souls are nourished, while the drink is the word of the knowledge of Christ according to the mystery of His birth and passion. Since, therefore, the covenant of God is set for us in the blood and passion of Christ, so that, believing the Son of God to have been born, and to have suffered according to the flesh, we may not in [mere] righteousness be saved, in which alone, without faith in the passion of Christ, there could be no salvation, for this reason it was said of the cup only, 'This is the cup of the new covenant.'" [2]

All this is mystical in the highest degree. It seems quite plain that Origen accepted with all his heart the common teaching of the Church as to the greatness of the sacramental elements, and that the bread of the Eucharist

[1] *P. G.* 12, 701.

[2] *In Matt.* Tractate 35, § 85. Ed. De La Rue T. iii. 897; *P. G.* 13, 754, 755.

was verily Christ's body, and the wine His blood. Then he embroidered upon these simpler truths soaring mysticisms, in which also he preached great truths. My own point is that when he puts aside the lower truth to make room for the higher, the thing which he thus puts aside, and in putting thus aside, shows to be the accepted doctrine of the Church, taught to all beginners in Christian doctrine, is just what I have been saying, — The bread *is*, not *contains*, our Lord's body, and the wine *is*, not *contains*, His blood. When Origen is urging Christians to rise from the Sacrament to our Lord Himself, it is not from His glorified body to His yet more glorious Person, that Origen calls their thoughts, but from the bread and wine to the Word, expressing Himself in all manner of "words." When he calls men to lift up the eyes of their faith above the bread and wine to what they stand for, it is not to our Lord's glorified body in heaven that he calls them, but straight to the Heavenly Word in His own Person. He simply has nothing to say of the glorified body of our Lord at all. I am sure that Origen would have said, with other Fathers of the Church, that the eucharistic body of our Lord was one with our Lord's body in heaven. He might well have said that it was the same with that body, if it had come in his way to say so. But that body does not come before him in his mystical flights.

IV

S. Dionysius the Great, Head of the Catechetical School, A.D. 232, Archbishop of Alexandria, A.D. 247

From Origen's great successor in the Catechetical School, S. Dionysius, Dr. Pusey quotes several passages in his Catena, but I find nothing in them that bears upon

the particular points which I am investigating, except that in a letter to a bishop, Basilides, he speaks of coming to the Holy Communion as *touching* the body and blood of Christ. That certainly looks as if he thought of the elements themselves as being really our Lord's body and blood. I ought to add that in his "letter to Paul of Samosata," [1] if it be genuine, Dionysius uses this language, "in order that we, the faithful, may be able to contain Him, and to become the abode of God, receiving Him whole." But there is nothing to show, or to hint, that "receiving God whole" had for S. Dionysius the connotation of the modern theological idea of the presence of "the whole Christ, body, blood, soul, and Divinity in every particle of the bread, and in every drop of the wine."

V

S. Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, A.D. 327–373

We pass to that very great man, Athanasius. One of his most striking expressions is preserved to us (from a sermon addressed to the newly baptized) in a sermon of Eutychius, a Patriarch of Constantinople in the sixth century: [2]

"So long as the supplications and prayers are not yet made, bare is the bread and the cup. But when the great and marvellous prayers are completed, the bread becomes the body, and the wine the blood, of our Lord Jesus Christ."

[1] We are told expressly by the Council of Antioch referred to in *Eusebius, H. E.* vii. 30, that Dionysius wrote a letter *to the council*, but would not consent to write to such a one as Paul. But this Epistle may after all be that of Dionysius, with a false heading, "*to* Paul of Samosata," instead of "*concerning* Paul of Samosata."

[2] The passages may be found in *Patrol. Graeca*, 26, col. 1325.

I ask you to note (as against the Roman theory) that he does not say that before the consecration the elements are bread and wine, but that afterward they are *not* bread and wine. He says that at first they are "mere," or "bare," bread and wine, and thus he implies that afterward they are bread and wine with an additional character. He does not say that the added fact is our Lord's body. He says rather that the elements themselves (with this additional fact, which he does not define) *are* the body and blood of the Lord. Further on in the sermon, he gives the same testimony still more tellingly:

"Let us come to the consecration of the mysteries. This bread and this cup, so long as the prayers and supplications are not yet said, are bare things (ψιλά). But when the great prayers and the holy supplications are sent up to God, the Word descends upon the bread and the cup, and His body is produced" (γίνεται).

I venture to claim that S. Athanasius clearly regarded the miracle of the Altar as a close parallel with the miracle of the Incarnation. He represents the Word as descending upon the bread and wine of our Eucharist and making for Himself a body, even as he descended into the womb of the blessed Virgin, and made for Himself a body. "This is a doctrine of 'Impanation,'" I imagine that some of my friends will be saying. If it is the doctrine of all the Fathers, I need not mind its being called by a nick-name; but I may remark that "Impanation" is a very late theological word, and stands for a doctrine that our Lord's natural body is *locally included* in the bread and wine of the Eucharist. I certainly do not find any such teaching in the writings of the early Church, nor commend any such. The analogy of the miracle of the Incarnation and the miracle of the Eucharist will come up for fuller consideration in my Seventh Lecture.

I simply point out now that it was not a new thought of the writers of the fifth century.

Meanwhile I must for honesty exhibit the kind of language used by S. Athanasius, which would be most likely to be appealed to as conveying the idea of some modern theologians. Thus in the fourth of his *Festal Letters*, that which announced the date of Easter for A.D. 332, he uses these words:

"Our Saviour, also, since He was changing the typical for the spiritual, promised them that they should no longer eat the flesh of a lamb, but His own, saying, 'Take, eat and drink, this is My body and My blood.'"[1]

"Not the flesh of a lamb, but His own." If you start with the assumption that our Lord has not, and cannot have, any other body than His natural body, as most modern theologians do, you must acknowledge that this points to our Lord's natural body. But surely, *if* our Lord makes bread to be His body, His flesh, in some new sense, that flesh is "His own." I add that if we take our Lord's natural body to be meant, we must make a considerable explanation as to its presence "after the manner of spirit" in the sacramental elements, or under their veils, which the Fathers never do make. They do not seem to have taught anything which to their minds required such explanation.

As an example of what Athanasius does have to say when the matter of "spiritual" interpretation comes directly in his way, I give a passage from the fourth of his Dogmatic Letters to Serapion (*Ep. ad Serapion.* iv. 19), in which he has been considering the words, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing."

[1] *P. G.* 26, 1379.

"Here also He has used both terms about Himself, namely flesh and spirit. And He distinguished the spirit from what relates to the flesh, in order that they might believe not only in what was visible in Him, but also in what was invisible, and might thereby learn that what He says is not fleshly, but spiritual. How many would the body be sufficient for, for eating, that it should become the food of the whole world? But for this reason He made mention of the ascension of the Son of Man into heaven, in order that He might draw them away from the bodily notion, and that from henceforth they might learn that the aforesaid flesh was heavenly eating from above, and spiritual food given by Him. For He says, 'What I have spoken unto you is spirit and life,' as much as to say, 'That which is manifested and is given for the life of the world is the flesh which I wear. But this and its blood shall be given to you by Me spiritually as food, so that this may be imparted spiritually to each one, and may become to all a preservative for resurrection to eternal life.' "[1]

I note with particular interest the suggestion that our Lord wanted to call attention from what was visible in Him to what was invisible, and his enquiry as to how much our Lord's body could do towards feeding a whole world, as showing that he really thought the heavenly reality in the Eucharist to be our Lord's life, rather than our Lord's body. Certainly, when Athanasius represents our Lord as speaking of "the flesh that I wear," he is thinking of our Lord's natural body. When, then, Athanasius goes on to present our Lord as saying, "This, and its blood, shall be given to you spiritually as food," many will understand him as meaning precisely what I have just now declared that the Fathers never say. I grant that the language can be taken in the sense of the Oxford School without the least forcing. But I claim that it is entirely patient of the other interpretation, too,

[1] *P. G.* 26, 665–667.

— "This, my natural body, shall be given to you spiritually through its extension which is My sacramental body." I venture to think also that the latter interpretation accords better with the earlier part of this same passage, and with the other passages which I have set before you.

VI

Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis, Contemporary of S. Athanasius

Bishop Serapion has left a Book of Prayers, which has of late years been restored to the Church's study. In it we find a eucharistic *Anaphora* containing this Invocation:

"O God of truth, let Thy Holy Word come upon this bread, that the bread may become the body of the Word, and upon this cup, that the cup may become the blood of the Truth."

Does Serapion think of the body of the Eucharist as our Lord's natural body, coming from heaven in a heavenly manner, to us unknown? or as a special, sacramental body, of a new order? The fact that he calls the bread a "*likeness*" of our Lord's body natural seems to me to point to the latter conclusion. These are the words used:

"To Thee we have offered this bread, the likeness of the body of the Only-begotten. This bread is the likeness of the holy body, because the Lord Jesus Christ in the night in which He was betrayed took bread, and brake, and gave it to His disciples, saying, 'Take, and eat, this is My body, which is being broken for you for the remission of sins.' Wherefore we also, making the likeness of the death, have offered the bread. . . . We have offered also the cup, the likeness of the blood, because the Lord Jesus Christ, taking a cup after supper, said to His own disciples, 'Take, drink, this is the new covenant, which is My blood which is being poured out for you for the remission of trespasses.'

Wherefore we also have offered the cup, presenting a likeness of the blood."

Dr. Darwell Stone remarks that this use of the word "likeness" (τὸ ὁμοίωμα) occurs only before the Invocation. Quite true, but it occurs *after* the solemn recital of our Lord's words, "This is My body," "This is My blood." Theologians who hold that these are words of Consecration are estopped from suggesting that this word of "likeness" is said of unconsecrated elements. Or is it meant by Dr. Stone that Serapion himself regarded the consecration as effected by the Invocation, and so used language which he would not have used, if he had not thus erred? But even supposing that Serapion used the word "likeness" of elements which he regarded as still unconsecrated, which I fully believe to be the case, it is noteworthy that he gives our Lord's words, "This is My body," as his own reason for calling this bread a *likeness* of our Lord's body.

It remains to quote a still earlier passage from the same *Anaphora:*

"O Lord of Hosts, fill also this sacrifice with Thy power and with Thy participation; for to Thee have we offered this living sacrifice, this bloodless offering."

I venture to assert that that, so common, patristic phrase, "the bloodless sacrifice," which we are now beginning to meet, carries in it at least a suggestion that those who used it thought that the word "blood" was used in a figurative sense in our Lord's revelation of the Holy Eucharist. It does not seem to me a natural phrase to have grown up in the minds of men who believed that blood *was* offered in their sacrifice, no matter how much they may have thought of it as blood raised into a new and higher order of being.

VII

S. Didymus, Head of the Catechetical School, Second Half of the Fourth Century

Our next witness shall be another head of the Catechetical School, Didymus, blind from childhood, so that he never learned to read, who yet became a noted teacher, numbering among his pupils Jerome, and Jerome's sometime friend, and later adversary, Rufinus. Jerome used to speak of him as "my seer," because he, blind, saw so much more than common men. In a commentary on Psalm xl. 7 (in the LXX version, which gives "A body hast Thou prepared for me," while our English Versions number the verse differently, and give "Mine ears hast Thou opened") he writes:

"Having abolished all Jewish sacrifices, . . . He brings in, in place therof, the bloodless and reasonable sacrifice of the body and blood of the Lord, in the new song of the new covenant, of which (body and blood) He said, 'Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life.' Wherefore He said, 'Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldst not; but a body Thou hast prepared for Me.' But Christ Himself prepared for the Church a body, which is the Lord's. And that He did not vaguely, but at the time of the mystical supper, when He said, 'Take, and eat.' This body, then, He prepared for our participation." (Quoted in Pusey, p. 442).[1]

[1] The original is to be found in the *Expositio Patrum Graecorum in Psalmos* of Corderius, 748.

I feel that I must add here the Greek of one sentence, with a translation of my own. For S. Didymus wrote this:

κατηρτίσατο σῶμα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, δηλαδή, τὸ Κυριακὸν Αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστός, οὐχ ἁπλῶς, ἀλλὰ αὐτῷ καιρῷ κτλ. . . . τότε τοίνυν κατηρτίσατο τὸ σῶμα πρὸς μετάληψιν.

"A body did Christ Himself prepare for the Church, that is to say, that body which represents the Lord, not without plan, but on the

I understand S. Didymus to say that our sacrifice is "without (literal) blood." That would be my interpretation of his "bloodless sacrifice." He also says that our Lord prepared for His Church a body, which was His own body, and yet a body newly prepared, at the time of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist. He seems to distinguish the body thus and then prepared from the natural body of our Lord, prepared thirty-four years earlier.

VIII

S. Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria (*circa* A.D. 400)

Two more Alexandrians shall be quoted, bringing us to the end of the fourth century. S. Theophilus is last in order, having been Archbishop from A.D. 385 to A.D. 412. But I quote him first, because he has but a single word to say, and a slight one.

The *Festal Letter* of Theophilus for A.D. 402 is preserved for us in a Latin translation by S. Jerome, in his *Letter XCVIII.*,[1] and in it the Pope of Alexandria speaks of

"the bread of the Lord, by which the body of the Saviour is shown."

As usual with the Fathers, it is the outward element which is spoken of as "the bread of the Lord," and it is not said, "in which the body of the Saviour is present," or "in which the body of the Saviour is hidden," but "by which the body of the Saviour is *shown*." I take the

very occasion etc. . . . At that time, then, did He prepare the body for participation." I may not have hit upon the right phrase to show what S. Didymus meant by τὸ Κυριακόν; but certainly it is not the same as τὸ Κυρίου.

[1] *P. L.* 2, 801.

phrase as meaning, "in which you see that which our Lord has taken to be His body sacramental." I do not think that it can be said without somewhat severely straining language, that by the element of bread in the Eucharist our Lord's natural body is "*shown*." That is just what, according to certain modern theologies, it is *not*. It is *there*, but it is *hidden*. S. Theophilus seems to have been thinking on different lines.

IX

S. Macarius, Monk, (A.D. 301–391)

I turn to S. Macarius, who lived for sixty years in the wilderness, and came to be an object of almost boundless admiration among the orthodox.

In his *Homily* 27 he has this language,—"that in the Church bread and wine are offered, an antitype of His flesh and blood, and that they who partake of the visible bread, spiritually eat the flesh of the Lord." [1]

Calling bread and wine "an antitype" of the body and blood seems to me to imply that the bread and wine are really existent things. But I must acknowledge that that particular phrase will bear readily enough either (1) the Virtualist interpretation, "the elements are the outward sign of a thing not present save in force and efficacy," or (2) the interpretation of the Oxford School, "the elements are the outward sign of a thing which they conceal within their veils," or (3) the idea which I am here presenting as that of the Fathers, "the elements are made actually to *be* our Lord's body and blood in a sense which is new and unique." A great deal of patristic language will bear either of these three interpretations. But in

[1] *P. G.* 34, 705.

his *Homily* 4 Macarius uses language which seems to me to be consistent only with the last of these three views of the Eucharistic Mystery. These are his words:

"The Spirit of the Lord cometh to the refreshment of worthy souls, to their exaltation and delight and life everlasting. For *the Lord embodieth Himself even into food and drink*, (as it is written in the Gospel, 'He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever,' that He may ineffably rest the soul, and fill it with spiritual joy; for He saith, 'I am the bread of life.' In like manner [He embodieth Himself] into drink of a heavenly fountain, as He saith, 'He who drinketh of this water which I shall give him, it shall be in him a fountain of living water springing up unto eternal life.' And we were all, it says, made to drink of the same drink."[1]

Dr. Pusey warns us (p. 446, n. 1) that "there is no special stress, in this passage, on the word σωματοποιεῖ, 'embodies,' as though it expressed the *mode* of the Presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist. It does express an indwelling, so to speak, a Presence within the consecrated elements, but no relation to them (such as 'Consubstantiation' has been used to express), nor any analogy to the Incarnation. For S. Macarius uses this same word, in this very context, to express the indwelling of the Godhead in faithful souls." I confess that I cannot follow this argument. For in the first place, I know not by what authority Dr. Pusey can speak for S. Macarius, and assure us that the elder saint laid no *stress* on his so remarkable word σωματοποιεῖ. Then, further, I should say that in the case of our Lord's indwelling in faithful souls He had not only a presence in them, but "a relation to them." And still further, I should say confidently that in the indwelling of our Lord in faithful souls our Lord Himself means us to find an "analogy to the Incarnation." I

[1] *P. G.* 34, 481.

cannot see how it is proved that S. Macarius did not think of our Lord as taking to Himself the bread of the Eucharist to be a body, distinct from His natural body, when it is shown that S. Macarius uses the same word of our Lord's embodying Himself in faithful souls, by which act we all agree that He *does* make for Himself a body distinct from His natural body, being, in fact, His mystical body, the Church. Let me write down a few of the sentences from this context of S. Macarius, and let them speak for themselves.

"The Infinite and Unapproachable and Uncreated God . . . embodied Himself, and, so to speak, contracted Himself from His unapproachable glory, that He might be able to be united with His visible creatures (as with souls of saints and with angels) that they might be able to partake of the life of the Godhead. . . . The Infinite and Inconceivable God . . . contracted Himself, and put on the limbs of this body, and gathered Himself from His unapproachable glory, and for His tenderness and love for men, being transformed, embodies Himself, and immingles Himself, and takes holy and well-pleasing souls, and becomes 'one Spirit' with them (according to the divine saying of Paul), soul, so to speak, to soul, and substance to substance, that the soul may be able to live in newness, and feel the immortal life, and become partaker of the incorruptible glory. . . . When He willeth, He becometh fire, . . . When He willeth, He is joy and peace, . . . But if He will to liken Himself to one of His creatures, . . . He can do all things as He wills. . . . All things are easy for Him, changing Himself, as He willeth, for souls faithful and worthy of Him. . . . For the Lord embodieth Himself even into food and drink."

S. Macarius says that our Lord *embodies* Himself in His Church, and in some like sort "embodies Himself" in the bread and wine of the Eucharist. I am willing, and glad, to leave that with you, as my last word for to-day.

LECTURE IV

BODIES IDENTIFIED, NOT NECESSARILY BODIES IDENTICAL, AND EXAMINATION OF THE TESTIMONIES OF THE ASIATIC SCHOOLS

SOME years ago, I found in a Manual of Instruction for Confirmation and First Communion, — a most excellent Manual, by the way, — prepared by a priest of the American Church, who has since been made a bishop, this extraordinary phrase: "Note carefully the distinction between the bread and wine and the Body and Blood of our Lord." "*Extraordinary!*" you may say. "What is extraordinary about *that?*" Well, it is certainly a very natural expression in these days. It is a fair expression of the general theological attitude of the Church, of the West, at any rate, for a thousand years past. But it does seem extraordinary to one who comes to it with a mind steeped in the language of the Fathers of the first five centuries. Distinction between the consecrated bread and wine of the Eucharist, on the one hand, and the body and blood of our Lord! Why, the idea would have been to all the early writers of the Church repulsive and unintelligible.[1] I am afraid that in their haste and

[1] A Roman writer (Fr. Vassall-Phillips in his translation of *S. Optatus*, p. 100, n. 1) rebukes one of our modern Anglicans for telling a story out of S. Optatus, and using this language: "The consecrated elements were thrown to the dogs." Fr. Vassall-Phillips complains, most justly: "S. Optatus writes nothing concerning 'the consecrated elements.' The very word 'elements' would have been incomprehensible to him in

heat they would have called it "heresy." I hasten to say that *I* do not call it "heresy." But I ask you to hold your minds open to the evidence that such Christian writers as are to speak to us to-day could not have said such a thing, and could not have understood such a thing. They could distinguish between our Lord's body in the Eucharist and our Lord's body in heaven. They could never have distinguished between the consecrated bread and our Lord's body in the Eucharist. Those were two names for the same thing.

But here I must enter a *cautela*, or if it shall seem to any hearers a better phrase, make an acknowledgment. Though the early Christian writers distinguish the eucharistic body of our Lord from His natural body in which He lived this earthly life, they yet identify these two bodies, and sometimes ascribe to one what belongs to the other. We shall find striking examples of these modes of speech in the writings of S. Augustine, coming to be considered in our next Lecture. If, instead of having numerous passages of his writing touching the mystery of the Eucharist, we had but two or three, and those limited to the type in which he speaks of Jews converted shortly after our Lord's Ascension as drinking of the blood which they had shed, S. Augustine would be quoted triumphantly as holding that the body which is upon the altar is identical with the body which hung upon

this connection. He *does* call the Eucharist 'the holy body' and 'the body of Christ.' It is impossible to avoid observing the contrast between Catholic terminology of the fourth, and Anglican terminology of the twentieth century." Quite true! It should be added that there are contrasts between modern Roman theology and that of the fourth century, too. Also, the early writers all held that the consecrated bread and wine remained as bread and wine, — they could have understood *that*, — and they spoke always of that bread and wine as being (not containing) the body and blood of the Lord.

the cross. He *is* so quoted even now. But we shall find that he has other passages not easily reconcilable with that view.

Yet here I can imagine some of the friends with whom I am usually in close agreement theologically, — friends who hold the "Oxford view," — saying to me, "It is necessary that we interpret S. Augustine and other Fathers so as to bring them into consistency with this view which you are rejecting. If they identify the natural body of our Lord with the body on the altar, as you yourself acknowledge, and eagerly profess, then it simply cannot be that they distinguish one from the other. You cannot, — *no rational being can*, — *distinguish two bodies, and yet identify them.* You cannot assign to one body the things which belong to another body, on the ground that each is the body of the Lord."

I know how irresistible that argument must seem to one who advances it. But let us consider. S. Paul teaches the resurrection of the flesh. He teaches the identity of the body that is raised with the body that is laid down. "All flesh is not the same flesh" is part of his argument, and suggests that he is prepared for much of difference. But certainly he teaches identity. "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption, . . . It is sown a psychic body; it is raised a spiritual body." It is the same subject of which he predicates the "corruption" and the "incorruption," the condition of being "psychical" — the translation "natural" has done a world of harm — and the condition of being "spiritual." S. Paul stands ready to say that the body which is sown is raised. I suppose that every man is ready to say that the body which he wears now is the body in which he was born, and grew up to manhood. And yet the body which I am wearing now has, quite possibly, not a single

particle of the matter which I was wearing sixty-five years ago. Identity of matter is not in the least necessary to secure the identity of my body in one estate of being with my body in another estate of being. Still more is this true, one may think, in the case of the resurrection. S. Paul teaches that the new body is a very different body indeed from the old one in its character and qualities. In his figure of the seed sown he may seem to suggest that some part of the material of the old body is taken to help in constituting the new body. I am sure that no theologian of to-day would insist that *all* the material of a body buried must be restored for the former owner's use in the body raised. I doubt if many theological scholars would insist that *any* of the particular material of the body that was buried must be used for the clothing of the spirit in the day of the bodily resurrection. It is enough to constitute identity of my body in one estate of being and my body in another estate of being that each body is *mine*. What is my embodiment at one time or place, and what is my embodiment at another time or place is all part of one embodying. It is all one body, for it is mine. And yet the body of my old age is one body, and the body of my early childhood is another body, and the body of my resurrection will be, in a very true sense, another. No matter how many bodies we may find a man to have, we instinctively identify them. It is one body all the way through. Our language is not unnatural, our thought is not irrational.

And let me add that the ascription of things which belong to one body of our Lord to another, because both are His, is no more strange than the language which speaks of "the Church of *God*, which He hath purchased with *His own blood*," or of the blessed Virgin as "the Mother of God," or of "the Son of Man, which is in

heaven," spoken when our Lord was not yet ascended in His body. And we shall do well to remember how S. Augustine identifies the eucharistic body of our Lord with His mystical body, the Church. "We *are*," says S. Augustine, "that which we receive." Yet every one of us will recognize that the body, the Church, is numerically "a different body," and is distinguishable as the body of our Lord, from that body which is enthroned in heaven. The conclusion which I draw from what I have been saying is that when we find any early Christian writer clearly identifying the body of our Lord in the Eucharist with the body of His natural flesh, or with the body of His glory, we are not thereby estopped from finding that that same Christian writer made that very distinction which we have found so many Christian writers making, between the one body and the other body, between the body which is bread divinely assumed, and the body which is flesh divinely assumed. With this *cautela* we may proceed to examine the testimony of writers of the different Asiatic Schools.

The School of Antioch, and Other Asiatic Schools

I

S. Ignatius of Antioch, the Burning Enthusiast, (*circa* A.D. 110)

S. Ignatius, made a martyr very early in the second century, after having been Bishop of Antioch, we know not how long, is an interesting witness because of his nearness to the Apostles. He makes it clear, in the few words of his that have come down to us, touching our subject, that the thought that the Sacrament of the Altar is a great power was one of the original thoughts of

the Church of Christ. He speaks of Christians as breaking "one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we should not die, but live in Christ for ever."[1] I ask you to observe, as we pass, that, after the manner of the Fathers generally, Ignatius looks upon the holy bread, an earthly element that can be broken by men's hands, as having this marvellous character of an "antidote that we should not die." Our saint says also, "Haste ye, then, to partake of one Eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for uniting men with His blood, one altar."[2] It should be observed that "one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ" is not necessarily a numerical expression. Certainly, "one Eucharist," "one cup," "one altar," are not numerical expressions. I mean that speaking of "one flesh" in this way does not necessarily exclude the possibility that several things might be equally worthy of the name, and be included under that designation. In that same view, most certainly, "one Eucharist," "one cup," "one altar," are not numerical expressions. S. Ignatius did not mean to imply that there were not many Eucharists celebrated, many cups used, many altars set up in Christian churches. And yet there can be no doubt, I think, that Ignatius would have been quite ready to say that there was but "one flesh" of our Lord even numerically, so earnestly does he fix his gaze on the identification of the body of the altar with the body natural. For writing against the *Docetae*, those heretics who maintained that our Lord could not have assumed anything so evil as a material body, he writes these words:

"They abstain from Eucharist and prayer, because they confess not that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus

[1] *Ad Ephes.* xx; *P. G.* 5, 661. [2] *Ad Philad.* iv.; *P. G.* 5, 700.

Christ, which suffered for our sins, which the Father in His mercy raised again. They, then, who speak against the gifts die disputing. Good had it been for them to love, that they might rise again."[1]

This, it will be observed, is a very distinct identifying of the body of the altar with the body of the cross and of the resurrection. I must not minimize its meaning. Yet I must here note two points by way of safeguard against unwarranted deduction from this strong language. The first is that such expressions are *rare* in the patristic writings. "What difference does it make," I can imagine one of my critics asking, "What difference does it make whether a thing is said often, or only said rarely, so long as it expresses the mind of the Catholic Church, and is entirely true?" I answer, that what is said very rarely by Christian writers in connection with a great mystery is likely to be something which *may* be said, because it is true *in a sense*, something which may be said with a stretching of our human words. I myself hold the language of Ignatius to be justifiable, but it is not what one finds, as one reads down through the early centuries, to be the *common* language of the Church.

The other point in connection with this phrase of S. Ignatius is that even here, where he is distinctly identifying the body of the Eucharist with the body of our Lord's earthly life, there is no indication of that turning of the mind's eye to the glorified body on the heavenly throne, which is so characteristic of modern devotion.

We have found such language as this of Ignatius exceptional in the West, and among the Alexandrians. We shall find it exceptional among the Asiatics, whom we are about to examine. This Ignatius was an ardent soul. The blunder of Latin writers in much later times,

[1] *Ad Smyrn.* 7; *P. G.* 5, 713.

who tried to connect his name with their Latin word, *ignis*, "a fire," was a wise sort of folly. He *was* "a fire," blazing up to heaven. They were right about that. Like another great saint of Antioch, three centuries later, S. John of the Golden Mouth, whose title we have kept nearly in its Greek form, as "Chrysostom," he came to the subject of the Holy Eucharist, not as a theological instructor, framing definitions with balanced care, but as a preacher, a poet, an orator, looking for the greatest things that he *could* say, to stir their hearts and arouse their emotions. It may be added in regard to our present author that these three scraps of writing which I have quoted are all that we have of this impassioned preacher on his way to martyrdom, by which to measure what may have been his utterances as a careful teacher expounding the subject of the Eucharist to pupils with minds as yet unformed.

I must add one more reflection. S. Ignatius here brings his eucharistic reference to bear against the *Docetae*, who would not acknowledge that our Lord's body of flesh could have been anything but a phantom deluding men's natural senses. If, now, he had regarded the Church as teaching that the bread of the Eucharist was not really our Lord's body, but only a veil deluding the senses, while behind that veil our Lord was offering men a body that was present only after the manner of spirit, without any *material* quality, I think that he would have avoided the subject of the Eucharist in this particular controversy, or else would have entered into careful explanations to show that the nature of the Presence in the Eucharist did not after all support the contention of the *Docetae*, as in that case they would certainly have claimed that it did. Doubtless, I shall be told that the Church had not yet got its mind clear as to the nature

of the Presence, had not, at the beginning of the second century, developed a theory of the Presence at all. That would, of course, minimize the value of Ignatius of Antioch as a theologian, and make his utterances of no particular value, except so far as they may seem to represent a settled habit of utterance on the part of the Church. We will pass on, then, and enlarge our collection of testimonies, for it is only the united testimony of many voices which will give us anything that we can rightly call the voice of the Church.

II

FRAGMENTS FROM ASIATICS OF THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES

Melito, Bishop of Sardis; Tatian, the Assyrian: S. Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea

There is a most remarkable paucity of great writers in the Asiatic provinces of the Church in the next two centuries after the martyrdom of S. Ignatius. Some of those who had great reputation in their day have left nothing that has come down to us. Some have left us nothing that touches our present subject. I group together a few fragments out of the second century and the third.

1. Melito, Bishop of Sardis, who in the year 170 presented a *Defense of Christians* to the Emperor Antoninus, wrote also a *Key to the Interpretation of Scripture*, referred to by its title in Latin versions as his *Clavis*, in which he set out to give the spiritual meaning of words used mystically in Scripture. One of the explanations in the *Clavis* is this:

"Wine: the blood of Christ in the Gospel. 'He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood.'"

Now the only passage in the Gospel where "wine" could be said to be used with a mystical meaning for "the blood of Christ" is in the words of distribution. The explanation in the *Clavis* makes it clear that to S. Melito "This is my blood" meant "This wine is my blood," not "This great heavenly gift which I am offering invisibly is my blood." It is only here that wine can be said to be used figuratively for "blood" in any Gospel.

2. A passage from Tatian, the Assyrian, maker of the first Harmony of the Gospels ever attempted, who was at Rome about A.D. 172, comes to much the same thing:

"And then having taken bread, and afterwards the cup of wine, He bore witness that it was His body and blood, and bade them eat and drink, for that it was a memorial of His coming suffering and death." [Pusey, 327.]

It simply shows that in the current Christian speech bread and wine were spoken of as being really the body and blood of the Lord. Tatian had fallen into one of the Gnostic heresies, but in this particular he speaks just as all Christians were speaking.

3. In the middle of the third century, we come to a great personage, S. Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, a friend of Origen, a correspondent of S. Cyprian. He was a power in his day, but not a voluminous writer, and we have from him as concerning the Eucharist only a passing word. He is writing of persons who had denied Christ in times of persecution, and were by most of the faithful regarded as excommunicate beyond restoration in this life. His letter is preserved as lxxv.[1] among the *Epistles of S. Cyprian:*

[1] *P. L.* 3, 1172.

"How great is the sin, whether of those who admit, or of those admitted, that . . . . they, in communion rashly granted, should touch the body and blood of the Lord, whereas it is written, 'Whosoever shall eat the bread, or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.'"

To S. Firmilian the body and blood of the Lord can be "touched." That is a natural expression to him, as to S. Didymus of Alexandria.

III

Early Fourth Century Writers: Adamantius and Eusebius of Caesarea

An anonymous writer whose book of Dialogues is printed along with the works of Origen, and who is quoted under the name of *Adamantius*, because he gives that name to the Catholic speaker in his debates, has this to say against the followers of Marcion:

"If, as these say, he was fleshless and bloodless, of what flesh and of what body, and of what blood, did He giving the images (εἰκόνας), both bread and cup, enjoin upon the disciples to make through these the memorial of Him?"[1]

Here that bread and wine which our Lord called His body and blood, and which the Church had constantly proclaimed to be made to be His body and blood, are called "images" of the Lord's body and blood. But it is not at all to be supposed that the writer of those words would have found any difficulty in using the more common language of the Church as well.

The same is true of Eusebius, the great Church historian, and Bishop of the Palestinian Caesarea. I find

[1] *P. G.* 11, 1840.

no passage in which he identifies the bread of the Eucharist with our Lord's body, though he is clear that we receive what is, in some sense, the body of our Lord in our communions. Probably he simply does not happen to use the more common speech. But he really does emphasize the idea that the bread and wine are symbols of our Lord's natural flesh and blood. And he makes it clear that he opposed "symbol" to "literal fact" exactly as we do. Speaking of this very subject of the Eucharist, in his *Demonstratio Evangelica* (to use the Latin title), he uses this language:

"Being admitted to the sacrifice and priestly ministration which are better than those of ancient times, we deem it no longer holy to fall back to the first and weak elements, which were symbols and images, but did not embrace the truth itself." [1]

Eusebius uses such words as "symbol" and "image" just as we do, and just as rational beings do generally. A "symbol" of a thing is not the thing itself. If certain bread is a "symbol" of our Lord's body, and also *is* our Lord's body, it must be a symbol of the body in one meaning of the word "body," and be actually the body in another meaning of the word "body." But let us hear what Eusebius has to say, himself. I make scattered extracts from the same book: [2]

"Having, then, received the memory of this sacrifice to celebrate upon the table by means of the symbols of His body and His saving blood, . . . We have been taught to offer, all life long, bloodless and reasonable and acceptable sacrifices to the supreme God through His High Priest, who is over all. . . . These sacrifices, immaterial and in idea (*ἀσωμάτους καὶ νοερὰς θυσίας*), again the words of the prophet proclaim [quot-

[1] *Dem. Ev.* I. x. 18; *P. G.* 22, 88.

[2] The context is given somewhat largely in Stone, pp. 110, 111.

ing Psalm l. 14, 15]." (*Dem. Evangel.* I. x. 28–38) . . . "After the manner of Melchizedek. . . . For as that priest of the Gentiles never seems to have used bodily sacrifices, but only wine and bread, when he blessed Abraham, so our Saviour and Lord Himself, and then all the priests who in succession from Him are throughout all the nations, . . . *represent in a mystery* (αἰνίττονται) with wine and bread the mysteries of His body and saving blood." [1]

In a later passage of the same book (VIII. i. 78–80) Eusebius comments thus on Jacob's blessing of Judah, Gen. xlix. 12:

"And I think that the passages, 'His eyes gladdening from wine,' [2] and 'His teeth whiter than milk,' again mystically refer to the mysteries of the new covenant of our Saviour. For it is my opinion that the words 'His eyes gladdening from wine' signify the gladness from the mystic wine which He gave to His own disciples, saying, 'Take, drink, this is My blood which is poured out for you for the remission of sins; do this for My memorial,' and that the words 'His teeth whiter than milk' signify the brightness and purity of the mystic food. For again He gave to the disciples the *symbols* of the divine dispensation, bidding them make the image (εἰκόνας) of His own body." [3]

There are a few more passages which I might quote, but these will be enough to show how the mind of Eusebius dwelt habitually on the thought of the elements in the Eucharist as "symbols," and as having a "mystic" meaning. He seems to me to be the first writer whom we have encountered who shows a mind cold toward mystery in revelation, rather than warm towards it. Of two

[1] *Dem. Evangel.* V. iii. 18, 19; *P. G.* 22, 365.

[2] Eusebius read the verse in the Greek of the LXX version: χαροποιοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ οἶνον.

[3] *P. G.* 22, 593, 596.

things which *might* be said, he seems invariably to say the lesser. Yet I do not think that he, though he had Arian leanings, really departed from the eucharistic theology of the Church. In a work on *The Theology of the Church* (iii. 12) he particularly distinguishes between the eucharistic body of our Lord and His natural body:

"Do you, receiving the Scriptures of the Gospels, perceive the whole teaching of our Saviour, that He did not speak concerning the flesh which He had taken, but concerning His mystic body and blood. . . . He instructed them to understand spiritually (πνευματικῶς) the words which He had spoken concerning His flesh and His blood; for, He says, you must not consider Me to speak of *the flesh which I wear* (ἣν περίκειμαι), as if you were to eat *that*, nor suppose that I command you to drink perceptible and corporal (σωματικὸν) blood. . . . These things profit nothing, if they are understood according to sense (αἰσθητῶς); but the Spirit is the Life, given to those who are able to understand spiritually."[1]

IV

S. Cyril of Jerusalem, Instructor of Catechumens

Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem from A.D. 351 to A.D. 386, is chiefly noted for his Catechetical Lectures, delivered to persons preparing for Baptism, Confirmation, and their first Communion, while he was still a presbyter, in 348. The first point to be noted about this careful and systematic theological teaching is that S. Cyril impresses upon his candidates a mental habit of grouping the outward elements of these three sacraments together, and regarding them in much the same way. All are bare elements, to begin with. All are consecrated, and so

[1] *P. G.* 24, 1071, 1074.

have some great thing done to them, after which they are not "bare" elements any more, but filled with spiritual power. Here is his language about Baptism:

"Look not to the laver, as being simple water, but to the spiritual grace that is given with the water. For as the things that are brought to the heathen altars, though simple in their nature, become defiled by the invocation of the idols, so contrariwise the simple (λιτὸν) water, on receiving the invocation of the Holy Ghost and of Christ and of the Father, acquires the power of holiness."[1]

In like manner S. Cyril speaks of the oil of Confirmation, now so unhappily disused in the Anglican Communion, by one of the worst, and most inconsistent, mistakes of our Reformers honestly endeavoring to restore the Church to a real primitive Catholicity of doctrine and usage:

"But beware of supposing this to be bare (ψιλὸν) ointment. For as the bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is no longer simple (λιτὸς) bread, but the body of Christ, so also is this holy ointment no longer bare ointment, nor, so to say, common (κοινὸν), after the invocation, but becomes Christ's gift of grace (χάρισμα), and by the coming of the Holy Ghost fit to impart His Godhead, which ointment is symbolically applied to thy forehead, and to thy organs of sense beside, and while thy body is anointed with visible ointment, thy soul is sanctified by the Holy and Life-giving Spirit."[2]

We are warned by Dr. Darwell Stone in his *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (I. 69) that it will not do to assume that writers who make this sort of comparison — we shall find the same thing in Gregory of Nyssa and Cyril of Alexandria — regarded the power that entered into the other sacraments as in any way

[1] Lect. iii. 3; *P. G.* 33, 429. [2] Lect. xxi. 3; *P. G.* 33, 1089, 1092.

comparable with the power that entered into the elements of the Holy Eucharist. The comparison, Dr. Stone would have us think, is in the fact that there is a change in each case, and that there comes a presence of power. This comparison must not be pressed to exclude great differences further on. That is quite just. But I would point out that S. Cyril was here instructing beginners, and if his comparison had carried along with it, in his own view, a tremendous contrast also, I humbly think that he would here, or somewhere in his addresses, have given some word of warning to that effect. As a matter of fact, he ascribes to the oil of Confirmation a special presence of our Lord in His Godhead (of course not without His Manhood, which is from His Godhead now inseparable). He must have ascribed as great a Presence of our Lord to the water of Baptism, surely, which he regarded as no longer mere water, but a sacrament by which men are made to be members of the very body of the Lord. In all three sacraments, according to the teaching of S. Cyril, our Lord embodies Himself. It is our task to find, if we can, how that embodying of Himself in the elements of the Eucharist by our Lord appeared to S. Cyril's mind. We shall find him asserting most emphatically that the bread and wine are the body and blood of our Lord, having been changed into them, and also using the words "type" and "antitype" as freely as Eusebius of Caesarea.

"Regard, then, the bread and the wine not as bare (ψιλοῖς) elements, for they are (τυγχάνει) [1] the body and blood of Christ, according to the declaration of the Lord." [2]

[1] I suggest that the Greek word τυγχάνω can be used for εἰμί only when there is an element of the accidental, the unexpected, or the non-literal. I think that I find here a suggestion of the last, the "non-literal." The words "body" and "blood" are without the article.

[2] Lect. xxii. 6; *P. G.* 33, 1101.

"He once at Cana of Galilee changed the water into wine akin to blood; and is it incredible that He should change wine into blood? . . . In the figure (*τύπῳ*) of bread is given to thee the body, and in the figure of wine is given to thee the blood, in order that by partaking of a body and blood of Christ thou mayest become of one body and of one blood (*σύσσωμος καὶ σύναιμος*) with Him. For so also do we become Christ-bearers (*χριστοφόροι*), since His body and blood are distributed throughout our members. Thus, according to the saying of the blessed Peter, we become partakers of the divine nature."[1]

"The seeming (*φαινόμενος*) bread is not bread, even though it is sensible to the taste, but the body of Christ, and the seeming wine is not wine, even though the taste will have it so, but the blood of Christ."[2]

"Trust not the judgment to thy bodily palate; no, but to unfaltering faith; for they who taste are bidden to taste not bread and wine, but the antitype (*ἀντιτύπου*) of the body and blood of Christ."[3]

These passages taken, each by itself, would be capable of sustaining different interpretations. I think that to make S. Cyril consistent with himself, we must apply such explanations as these: (1) "The seeming bread is *not* bread" will mean plainly that that which seems to be *mere* bread is *not* mere bread, but our Lord's (eucharistic) body; (2) "In the figure of bread is given to thee the body" will have to be taken appositionally, as when we say that "we see in our Lord the pattern man"; (3) we must particularly note that according to S. Cyril the body and blood of our Lord are "distributed throughout our members," i. e., he gives these great names to the material elements by which our bodies are nourished.

But we must here add that just as S. Cyril has one sense of the words "body" and "blood" in which he can

[1] Lect. xxii. 2, 3; *P. G.* 33, 1097, 1100.

[2] Lect. xxii. 9; *P. G.* 33, 1104. [3] Lect. xxiii. 20; *P. G.* 33, 1120.

speak of our Lord's body and blood as being distributed throughout our members, so also he has a mystical use of the word "bread," — for he is a mystical soul, — in which he will say that our "bread" cannot be subject to bodily processes. Hear him commenting on the Lord's Prayer, in which he read ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον (which we render "daily bread"), and took it as meaning "*substantial bread*":

"Give us this day our substantial bread. This common bread is not substantial (ἐπιούσιος), but this holy bread is substantial, that is, appointed for the substance (οὐσία) of the soul. For this bread does not go into the belly, and is not cast out into the draught, but it is imparted to your whole system for the benefit of body and soul." [1]

Here he is taking "this holy bread" as a title of our Lord Himself, acting the part of "bread." It is as natural to him to do that as to use the words "body" and "blood" (under our Lord's direction) for bread and wine which our Lord uses as a body and a blood.

I add one more passage, which is of interest because it seems to be a plain allusion to the Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem, as S. Cyril used to hear it used.

"We beseech the merciful God to send the Holy Ghost upon the oblations, that He may make the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ, for whatever the Holy Ghost has touched, is surely consecrated and changed." [2]

[1] Lect. xxiii. 15; *P. G.* 33, 1113, 1116.
[2] Lect. xxiii. 7; *P. G.* 33, 1113, 1116.

V

S. Epiphanius, Encyclopedic Scholar, Bishop A.D. 367–403

Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis in the Island of Cyprus, called from his exceptional knowledge of languages "the man of five tongues," for to Greek and Latin he added Egyptian, Hebrew and Syriac, was not a man of broad mind, of generous sympathies, of any particular heights or depths. All the more we may take him as reflecting just the common theology of his day. Like S. Cyril of Jerusalem, he calls the eucharistic elements "antitypes," and also brings Baptism and the Eucharist into closer comparison than is common in modern theology.

"When Abraham was eighty or ninety years old, more or less, then Melchizedek met him, and brought forth bread and wine, prefiguring the mysteries of the sacraments, which are antitypical of our Lord, who said, 'I am the living bread,' antitypical, too, of the blood from His pierced side, which flowed forth for the purification of those that are defiled,[1] and for the cleansing and salvation of our souls."[2]

I think it worth while to point out that the writer does not set forth the sacramental wine as an antitype of an invisible spiritual reality by it conveyed. He points to the wine as an antitype of a past historical fact, of something, in fact, which has ceased to exist. The wine, according to fourth century opinion, was an antitype of the blood shed from the pierced side long ago. It *was* the blood that Christians were receiving now.

[1] Dr. Pusey strangely translates τῶν κεκοινωμένων, "of those who communicate." It certainly means, "of those who have been made common" (κοινοί), that is, unholy.

[2] *Adv. Haer.* 55 n. 6; Pusey, p. 101; *P. G.* 41, 981.

In his exposition of the Faith, with which he concluded his book *Against Heresies*, he refers to the fulfilling of the prophet's word "concerning the transfer of power, concerning the offer of salvation by the power," — he is referring to Isaiah iii. 1, where we read of God's taking from Jerusalem "the staff of bread and the staff of water," and he regards these as taken from the elder church to be given to the later, —

"concerning the offer of salvation by the power of bread taken from Jerusalem, and by the strength of water. And here the power of bread and the strength of water being made strong in Christ, that not bread may be made power for us, but power attach to bread, bread is indeed a food, but the power must be in it to gender life. And this is not (a plan) that water should save us by itself, but that in the power that belongs to the water by help of faith and active work and hope and the ministering of sacraments and the entitling of sainthood, it should come to be to us an accomplishment of salvation."[1]

It seems noteworthy that here, as with S. Cyril of Jerusalem, there is no suggestion that the power of our Lord present in the element of water is less than, or different from, the power of our Lord present in the elements of bread and wine. It may be observed also that in this passage, which is one of those offered by Dr. Pusey in support of such a phrase as that our Lord's body is "*in* the eucharistic bread," Epiphanius does not say that our Lord's *body* is in the bread, but our Lord's "*power*." The power of our Lord was in the bread. Therefore the bread *was* His body.

[1] *Exposition of the Faith*, 16; *P. G.* 42, 812, 813.

VI

S. Ephraim, the Syrian, Poet and Mystic (A.D. 300?–373)

Our next witness brings us to a distinctly new source of testimony as to the Church's tradition. He lived a long life in Mesopotamia, just on the borderland where the Roman Empire was engaged for centuries in a struggle against the Kingdom of Parthia. An oriental, an ascetic, a mystic, and a poet, he will use a language different in some of its expressions from any that we have heard before, as when he speaks of our Lord as clothing Himself with bread, but we shall find, I am sure, the same fundamental beliefs as in the Fathers of the less distant East. His writings, all in Syriac, — we are distinctly told in the *Church History* of Theodoret that he had "not tasted Greek instruction," — used to be read in Church after the Scripture Lessons, according to S. Jerome, in the Syriac-speaking East. S. Ephraim — he is commonly cited as *Ephrem Syrus* — had to resist the heresy of the Marcionites, who held that matter was essentially evil, and therefore that our Lord had no real body of flesh and blood. Against their teaching he argues from the Holy Eucharist, which they did receive and celebrate:

"They have but a likeness of blood, who own not the body of Christ. Where is the true body, there is also the true blood. If because the body is defiled and hateful and loathsome, the Lord abhorreth it, in that case the cup of redemption is in the house of devils."

The argument is that if the human body is a foul thing, which our Lord would not wear, then He could not take to Himself the wine of their own Eucharist, and the only

fit place for a material sacrament must be in the service of evil powers. But this, argues S. Ephraim, is contrary to the acknowledged facts of the Eucharist. Hear how the argument goes on:

"And how did He loathe the body, and yet clothe Himself with bread in the Eucharist? Whereas lo! bread is the brother of weak flesh. And if dumb bread pleases Him, how much more the speaking body."[1]

Our Lord *clothes Himself with bread.* Bread is "*the brother* of weak flesh." These phrases seem to show that S. Ephraim felt very deeply the analogy between our Lord's Incarnation and His "Impanation," if I may call it so. I protest, by the way, that "Impanation" is as good a word, in spite of having been used most basely in some past times, as ὁμοούσιος was when taken up by the Council of Nicaea, in spite of base use, and formal condemnation in such use, beforetime.

Dr. Pusey quotes a passage from the Eleventh Rhythm on the Nativity, and says that in it the poet speaks of the Holy Eucharist as "the Image of Christ" and as "shadowing forth Christ." The poet does speak of the Eucharist as "shadowing forth Christ," but I must point out that the venerable father who comments on him quite failed to see what S. Ephraim meant by "*the image*" of our Lord. By that phrase he referred to our Lord's natural body of flesh and blood, and he distinguishes it most particularly from the eucharistic body, that bread which becomes "living bread." Here is the passage, which is cast in the form of an address by the Blessed Virgin to our Lord, wherein she views the Infant in the manger, and yet sees in vision all His accomplishment in the life of the Church that is to be:

[1] *Adv. Haeres.* Rhythm 4; Pusey, p. 78.

"In Thy visible form I see Adam, and in Thy hidden form I see Thy Father who is joined with Thee. Am I, then, the only one to whom Thou hast shown Thy beauty in two forms? Thee let bread shadow forth, and also the mind; dwell also in bread, and in the eaters thereof. In secret, and openly too, may thy Church see Thee, as well as Thy Mother.

"He that hateth Thy bread is like unto him that hateth Thy body. He that is far off that desireth Thy bread, and he that is near that loveth Thine image, are alike. In the bread, and in the body, the first and also the last have seen Thee."

Surely the meaning is clear. The worshippers before the altar, who are "afar off," and see "in secret," are contrasted with the disciples who surround our Lord in His earthly life, who are "near" and see "openly." Both see our Lord quite truly, but the first see Him clothed in His bread, and the last see Him in His "image." Now to carry the quotation somewhat farther:

"Yet Thy visible bread is far more precious than Thy body; for Thy body even unbelievers have seen, but they have not seen Thy living bread. They that were far off rejoiced; their portion utterly scorns that of those that are near.

"Lo! Thy image is shadowed forth in the blood of grapes on the bread,[1] and it is shadowed forth on the heart with the finger of love, with the colors of faith. Blessed be He that by the image of His truth caused the graven images to pass away."

The "image" referred to here is in every case our Lord's natural body. His "visible bread," His eucharistic body, is here declared to be far more precious than even that dear and holy flesh! "Dwell also in bread" is S. Ephraim's idea of a right prayer for our Lord's eucharistic Presence. The bread is called our Lord's body, not

[1] In the Syrian Liturgy the priest used to dip a portion of the consecrated bread in the cup, and sprinkle the rest of the bread with it.

because our Lord's body is there from heaven, but because He Himself has taken this "visible bread" to be a new body. What does S. Ephraim really find in the hallowed bread? Let another passage tell us. I will only say beforehand that it will not be a body and blood, but "a Spirit that cannot be eaten," and "a Fire that cannot be drunk." These are the poet's words:

"In Thy visible vesture there dwelleth a hidden power. A little spittle from Thy mouth became also a great miracle of light in the midst of its clay."

"In Thy bread is hidden the Spirit that cannot be eaten; in Thy wine there dwelleth the Fire that cannot be drunk. Thy Spirit in Thy bread and the Fire in Thy cup are distinct miracles, which our lips receive."

"When our Lord came down to the earth, to mortal men, He created them a new creation, as in the angels He mingled Fire and the Spirit, that they might be of Fire and Spirit in a hidden manner." . . .

"To the angels, which are spiritual, Abraham brought bodily food, and they ate. A new miracle it is, that our mighty Lord giveth to bodily creatures Fire and the Spirit, as food and drink."

I interrupt my quotation here to ask if S. Ephraim does not make it entirely clear that to *his* mind the Heavenly Reality in the Holy Eucharist was a purely spiritual force, not material, not bodily. "Bodily food" is expressly contrasted with it. And, as so constantly happens, he makes no mention of any presence of any body of the Lord in the sacrament, except as he refers to the hallowed bread as being itself our Lord's body, because in it He dwells. I must add a few more verses from this poem:

"Fire came down upon sinners in wrath, and consumed them. The fire of the Merciful cometh down in bread and abideth. Instead of that fire which devoured men, ye eat a fire in bread,

and are made alive. As fire came down on the sacrifice of Elijah, and consumed it, the Fire of Mercy hath become to us a living sacrifice. Fire ate up the oblations, and we, O Lord, have eaten Thy Fire in Thy oblation." . . .

"O Might hidden in the veil of the sanctuary! Might which the mind never grasped! It hath His love brought down, and It descended, and lighted upon the veil of the altar of propitiation. Lo! Fire and Spirit in the bosom of her that bore Thee! Lo! Fire and Spirit in that river wherein Thou wast baptized! Fire and Spirit in *our* Baptism! In the bread and the cup is Fire and the Holy Ghost!" (*De Scrutin.* x. 3, 5, 7. Pusey, 122.)

Again I note the habit of S. Ephraim's mind, which finds a parallel between the Incarnation, and the descent of our Lord into the Jordan to sanctify water for a sacrament from thenceforward, and between His Presence in Baptism, and His Presence in the Eucharist. Another example of this last habit is found in *De Scrutin.*, Rhythm vi. 2. (Pusey, 415.)

"In bread the Strong One that cannot be eaten is eaten; in strong wine also is drunk the Power that cannot be drunk; we also anoint ourselves with oil with the Power which cannot be used as ointment."

So also in one of the *Funeral Hymns* we read thus:

"Spare the body and the soul! Thou who didst mingle Thy body with our body, and didst join Thy Spirit with our spirit. Lo! in our body is Thy Baptism, and in our persons Thy living body. In us, Lord, there is a portion from Thee; let us not be a portion for the fire!" (*Cant.* 12. Pusey, 416.)

So, too, in *Paraen.* 29 (*Tom.* iii. 480, Pusey, 420):

"The departed, who were clothed with Thee, O Lord, in Baptism, and ate of Thy body, and drank Thy living blood, may

they rise, Lord, on the right hand, and with the angels, be filled with joy in Eden!"

I close our study of S. Ephraim with three quotations emphasizing three several points. The first shows us S. Ephraim calling the wine "our Lord's blood" (sacramental) and "the *token* of His blood" (natural) in the same breath:

"I have with me the token of Thy blood, a weapon whereat the vast mouth of hell, which hungers and thirsts for the wicked, shrinks back affrighted. Through the blood of the Lamb death shrank back from the Hebrews. Through Thy precious blood, O Lord, how shall hell shrink back!" (*Paraen.* 3. *Tom.* iii. 386. Pusey, 418.)

My second quotation indicates that to S. Ephraim's mind the bread of the Eucharist was the very material out of which the body of our Lord was made. It comes from his commentary on Ezek. x. 2:

"Those coals again, and the man who bringeth them, and scattereth them upon the people, are a type of the priest of God, through whom the living coals of the life-giving body of our Lord are given. But this, that another, a cherub, stretched out, and placed them in his hand, this is a type that it is not the priest who can of bread make the body, but another, who is the Holy Spirit." (*Tom.* ii. 175. Pusey, 123.)

The last quotation is one which renews most strikingly the parallel of the miracle of the Incarnation with the miracle of the Eucharist:

"The garment, seeing that it was the covering of Thy Human Nature, and Thy body, seeing that it was the covering of Thy Divine Nature, coverings twain they were to Thee, the garment and the body, that bread, the bread of life. Who would not

marvel at Thy changes of garment? Lo! the body covers Thy glorious fearful brightness; the garment covered Thy feebler nature; the bread covereth the Fire which dwells therein." (*Paraen.* 23. *Tom.* iii. 458. Pusey, 124.)

VII

The Great Cappadocians: Basil and the Gregories

About A.D. 375 the three most eminent Christian teachers in Asia Minor were Basil, Archbishop of Caesarea, and Exarch (having general supervision of all its provinces) of the Roman "Diocese" of Pontus; Basil's friend, Gregory, Bishop of Nazianzus; and Basil's brother, Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa. Curiously enough, the chief of the three, he who has come to be known as S. Basil the Great, has left us nothing in his writings which throws any light on his opinions as to the Holy Eucharist. Gregory of Nazianzus has left us very little. But Gregory of Nyssa has much to say, and in what he says he is the spokesman for this commanding group.

What remains of S. Gregory of Nazianzus may be dealt with in few words. In his funeral oration on his sister, Gorgonia (Oration viii. 18),[1] he is found speaking of the consecrated elements, reserved, as "whatever of the antitypes of the precious body or blood her hand treasured." He speaks of the clergy as those "who are to be over the people, and to handle the mighty body of Christ," and again as those "who approach to the approaching God" (Oration xxi. 7).[2] It seems worthy of note that in asking the prayers of a friend he says (*Ep. ad Amphilochium*, clxxi),[3]

[1] *P. G.* 35, 809. [2] *P. G.* 35, 1088. [3] *P. G.* 37, 280, 281.

"Be not slack in prayer and pleading for us, when by the word you draw down the Word, when with the bloodless cutting you divide the body and blood of the Lord, having your voice as a knife."

"Bloodless cutting" implies that in one sense there is no blood there. Our Lord's natural blood is not present at all. "When . . . you *divide* the body and blood" seems to imply, even as "body *or* blood" in our first extract implied, that S. Gregory thought of the consecrated bread as being our Lord's body, and of the consecrated wine as being His blood, in such sense that the body and blood so brought to pass were divided, one from the other. He does not seem to have held the view, which so many moderns regard as a first foundation of orthodoxy, that our Lord's body and blood are equally present in the bread, and equally present in the wine, and cannot be supposed to be divided.

We pass to the detailed examination of the testimony of

S. Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, A.D. 372–395

The key to S. Gregory's eucharistic doctrine is to be found in two works of his, — a sermon on the Baptism of Christ, and a writing called the *Great Catechism*, or *Sermo Catecheticus Magnus*. Let me present first the passage from the sermon on our Lord's Baptism and the Christian sacrament of Baptism. The preacher asks why water is needed as well as Spirit in this saving act. His answer is that man is "not simple, but compound." The twofold being needs a twofold remedy, "for his visible body, water, the sensible element; for his soul, which we cannot see, the Spirit, invisible, invoked by faith, present unspeakably." S. Gregory's idea of a sacrament seems to be that of our Catechism, — a ma-

terial form, which, continuing itself unchanged, becomes instinct with a divine grace. He goes on to show by a series of illustrations how commonly God uses this method, and the Eucharist is brought in as one of these illustrations, in no wise distinguished from the rest as to this central point.

"For this holy altar, too, by which we stand, is stone, ordinary in its nature, nowise different from the other slabs of stone that build our houses, and adorn our pavements; but seeing that it was consecrated to the service of God, and received the benediction, it is a holy table, an altar undefiled, no longer touched by the hands of all, but of the priests alone, and that with reverence. The bread, again, is, up to a certain time, common bread, but when the mystery consecrates it, it is called, and it becomes, the body of Christ. So with the sacramental oil; so with the wine."

S. Gregory goes on to show how the priest is made to be another man by his ordination, —

"without being at all changed in body or in form; but, while continuing to be in all appearance the man he was before, being, by some unseen power and grace, transformed (*μεταμορφωθείς*) in the unseen to the higher state."[1]

A little later, it is true, our saint gives the further illustration of Moses' rod:

"When God willed to accomplish through it mighty miracles beyond all words, He changed the wood into a serpent."

But he thinks of the Eucharist, and speaks of it, along with cases in which the material thing was *not* changed into some other material thing, but remained, bearing new power. He even refers to the oil of Confirmation between the bread of the altar and the wine of the altar, so much does it appear to him as a parallel illustration of

[1] *P. G.* 46, 581.

sacramental power. And with him, as with other Fathers, the natural way of expressing the relation of the hallowed bread to our Lord Himself is not to say that it *enshrines* His body, but that "it *is called*, and *becomes*, the body of Christ."

In the *Great Catechism* (XXXVII) S. Gregory goes further. He there offers an attempt, which Dr. Pusey describes (on his p. 180) as "standing alone in antiquity," to give a philosophy of the eucharistic miracle. Bodies may be made out of a variety of materials, seems to be S. Gregory's thought. He enumerates various foods of animals and men, and declares that when you look at a man's food, you are, in effect (δυνάμει), looking at the bulk of his body. He describes our Lord's natural body as being "in effect, bread," because it was made out of that common material of the food of men. In like manner, he declares that "if a person sees bread, he also, in a kind of way, looks on a human body." He also speaks of the bodies of believers as being composed of what they eat and drink, which is partly wine and bread. All this is offered to show how our Lord may have a body consisting of bread, and blood consisting of wine, at the altar.

The passage that I am about to quote is cited triumphantly by Roman theologians for the sake of a phrase in which the bread of the Eucharist is said to be "transmade" (μεταποιεῖσθαι) "into the body of God the Word." That word "transmade" is urged as implying a belief in a change of substance. I will not burden these pages with a labored examination of that point. Dr. Pusey shows abundantly (Pusey, pp. 179–189) that this word "transmake" is used not only by others among the Fathers, but by S. Gregory himself, of a number of

changes which cannot possibly be thought of as implying changed substance, as of "the transmaking of Moses to a more glorious appearance"; of the goodness of God, "transmaking him who receiveth it to itself"; of men, "transmade in nature to that which is more Divine"; and even (in speaking of our Lord Himself), of "the change and transmaking of the human nature into the Divine." In this very oration S. Gregory uses the word of three changes besides that of the sacramental elements, — of our own bodies into our Lord's body; of our Lord's natural body into the divine dignity; and of our Lord's food into the substance of His natural body. Only one of these changes (the last named) is a change of substance, and even that change is in no way analogous to the change suggested in the word "Transubstantiation." But let us turn to the oration itself.

"If the subsistence of every body depends on nourishment, and this is eating and drinking, and in the case of our eating there is bread, and in the case of our drinking there is water sweetened with wine, and if, as was explained at the beginning, the Word of God, who is both God and the Word, coalesced with man's nature, and when He came in a body such as ours, did not innovate on man's physical constitution, so as to make it other than it was, but secured continuance for His own body by the customary and proper means, and controlled its subsistence by food and drink, the former of which was bread, — just, then, as in the case of ourselves, as has been repeatedly said already, if a person sees bread, he also in a kind of way, looks on a human body, for by the bread being within the body the bread becomes the body, so also, in that other case, the body into which God entered by partaking of the nourishment of bread, was in a certain measure the same with bread, that nourishment, as we have said, changing itself into the nature of the body. For that which is peculiar to all flesh is acknowledged also in the case of that flesh, namely, that that body, too, was maintained by bread,

which body also by the indwelling of God the Word was transmade to the dignity of Godhead. Rightly, then, do we believe that now also the bread which is consecrated by the word of God is transmade into the body of God the Word. For that body was once in effect bread, but has been consecrated by the inhabitation of the Word that tabernacled in the flesh. Therefore, from the same cause as that by which the bread that was transformed in that body was changed to a divine potency, a similar result takes place now. For as in that case, too, the grace of the Word used to make holy the body, the substance of which came of the bread, and in a manner was itself bread, so also in this case the bread 'is sanctified,' as the Apostle says, 'by the word of God and prayer'; not that it advances by the process of eating to the point of becoming the body of the Word, but it is at once transmade into the body by means of the Word, as the Word said, 'This is My body.' . . . He bestows these gifts as He transelements the nature of the visible thing to that immortal thing by means of the consecration."[1]

I can understand S. Gregory's speculation in only one way. He seems plainly to have held that our Lord takes the elements of the Eucharist to Himself, and makes of them a body and blood in extension of His natural body, as He used to take food and add it to His natural body when He was on earth. The Word which formerly glorified bread transmuted into flesh now glorifies bread without first transmuting it into (literal) flesh. But He does make it to be truly a body for His sacred service. Only we are to observe that that enlargement of our Lord's body which was accomplished, when He was on earth, by processes natural and slow is now accomplished suddenly and by miracle, the bread of our Eucharist being, as S. Gregory says, "at once transmade into the body by means of the Word."

[1] For the use of μεταστοιχειόω ("transelement") by the Fathers, see Pusey, pp. 195–210. The text is in *P. G.* 45, 96, 97.

LECTURE V

THE GREAT WRITERS BETWEEN THE SECOND AND THIRD GENERAL COUNCILS: CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 381, EPHESUS, A.D. 431

A. *The Latin Fathers*

THE last quarter of the fourth century and the first quarter of the fifth were marked by the presence of a group of writers of very large output and of extraordinary power. The philosopher, Augustine, the scholar, Jerome, and the orator, John Chrysostom (John of the mouth of gold), were enough to glorify that brief space, if there were no more. I shall devote this Lecture to an examination of the testimony of the two Latin Fathers, Augustine and Jerome.

I

S. Augustine, the Philosopher, Bishop of Hippo, A.D. 354–430

The testimony of S. Augustine is of special interest, partly because he was a voluminous writer, and a very large proportion of what he wrote has been preserved to our day, but much more because he was a man of many-sided mind. Many men might write folios, but what they said on page after page, and in volume after volume, would be the same thing over and over. Augustine has his favorite ideas, which he repeats frequently, but he was very notably a man who looked at things in many

ways. He was not in the habit of throwing in repeatedly in his discourses such phrases as "in some sense" and "so to speak," but he very well might have. Like most great men, he tries to make words his instruments for expressing ideas outside the ordinary range of common men with their common speech. So, most naturally, he is sometimes hard to understand, and sometimes he will seem to contradict himself. You will need to be on the lookout, as you read him, to take his words in *his way*. Common and simple ways will not do. Augustine of Hippo was not a common and simple man.

We are dealing, it is to be remembered, with the question whether our Lord's words, "This is My body," suggested to the early Christian teachers a mysterious presence on the altar of our Lord's glorified body, which is in heaven, or rather the making of the hallowed bread to be our Lord's body in some new way and in some new meaning. Now the first thing that I shall note about S. Augustine is a negative thing. I cannot show it by quotations short of spreading before you all that we have of his teaching concerning the Holy Eucharist. For that I have not space. I must ask you to take my word for it, — or much better than that, search the Augustinian quotations on the Eucharist for yourselves, as they are given in Dr. Pusey's volume, and see whether I say truly, — that S. Augustine never, when he is speaking of the Eucharist, refers to the body of our Lord as being in heaven, or as coming down to the altar, or as being present *in* the element of bread. Some of you, who do not know Augustine's phrases familiarly will be saying, "Oh! That *must* be impossible!" Others, who do know Augustine's phrases well, will say, "That is not true! S. Augustine speaks over and over of our eating in the Eucharist the bread which comes down from heaven.

Does not the Lecturer know that?" Oh! yes. I know that patent fact quite well, but I must point out that S. Augustine explains "the Bread from heaven" as meaning our Lord in His Person, in His Divine-human life. I repeat my statement that S. Augustine never, in all his many utterances, speaks of our Lord's body as being in heaven, or coming from heaven, or as being present in the consecrated bread, when he is writing of the Presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist. It is from the modern point of view a notable omission.

A second point to be insisted on in the examination of S. Augustine's writings is this: Augustine is clear that something which is "the body of our Lord" in one sense is to be identified with something else, which is "the body of our Lord" in a different sense. My point is that he identifies the body of our Lord received in the Eucharist with the mystical body, the Church. He identifies thoroughly, as one and the same body, two bodies which he certainly did not regard as identical. Here is an extract from a sermon for Easter Day:

"I promised to you who have been baptized a sermon, in which I was to explain the sacrament of the Lord's table, which you have even now seen, and of which you became partakers, last night.[1] Ye ought to know what ye have received, what ye are about to receive, what ye ought daily to receive. That bread which ye see on the altar, consecrated by the word of God, is the body of Christ. That cup, or rather what that cup holds, consecrated by the word of God, is the blood of Christ. In this way the Lord willed to impart His body, and

[1] The baptism of the catechumens had taken place in the late evening of Easter Even, Confirmation being a part of the baptismal rites in those days, and had been followed by a midnight mass. This sermon was preached in the service of Easter morning.

His blood, which He shed for the remission of sins. If you have received well, you are that which you have received." [1]

"You *are* that which you have received." This is a plain identification of the sacramental body and the mystical body. The same teaching appears in another sermon:

"That virtue which is there understood is unity, that being joined to His body, and made His limbs, we may be that which we receive." [2]

In like vein Augustine speaks in his *Tractates on the Gospel of S. John*, commenting on vi. 51:

"The faithful know the body of Christ, if they neglect not to be the body of Christ. Let them become the body of Christ, if they wish to live by the Spirit of Christ. None lives by the Spirit of Christ but the body of Christ. . . . Wouldest thou then also live by the Spirit of Christ? Be in the body of Christ. For does my body live by thy spirit? My body lives by my spirit, and thy body by thy spirit. The body of Christ cannot live but by the Spirit of Christ. It is for this that the Apostle Paul, expounding this bread, says: 'One bread,' saith he; 'we, being many are one body.'" [3]

It seems to me a point worth observing that Augustine's thought dwelt on the idea that it was indwelling spirit that made matter to be a body. My spirit makes my body to be my body. At least, he could have understood the claim, if he had heard one saying, "What makes the bread of our altars to be our Lord's body is the indwelling of His Spirit, even as in His natural flesh."

Returning to the words of S. Augustine himself, I take

[1] *Sermon* 227. Pusey, 528, 529; Stone, 95; *P. L.* 38, 1099.
[2] *Sermon* 57. Stone, 95; *P. L.* 38, 589.
[3] *Tractate* xxvi. 13. Pusey, 511; *P. L.* 35, 1612, 1613.

a passage from his book *On the City of God.* He is arguing against persons who minimize in various ways what he holds to be the teaching of Scripture as to Eternal Punishment:

"There are others who promise deliverance from eternal punishment, not indeed to all men, but only to those who have been washed with Christ's baptism, who have become partakers of His body, howsoever they may have lived, in whatsoever heresy or impiety, on account of what Jesus saith: 'This is the bread which came down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. . . . If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever.' . . . There are also those who do not promise this even to all who have the sacrament of Christ and of His body,[1] but to Catholics only, because they have eaten the body of Christ, not sacramentally only, but in reality (*non solo sacramento, sed re ipsa*), being incorporated in that very body of His, of which the Apostle says, 'We, being many, are one bread and one body,' so that although they have afterwards lapsed into some heresy, or even into heathen idolatry, yet simply because in the body of Christ, that is, in the Catholic Church, they have received the Baptism of Christ, and eaten the body of Christ, they shall not die forever." . . . "He who is in the unity of that body, that is, in the fast hold [*compage*] of the members of Christ, of which body the faithful are wont to receive the sacrament from the altar in their communions, he is truly to be said to eat the body of Christ and to drink the blood of Christ." [2]

Calling the Church "the body of our Lord" is figurative language, as all agree. S. Augustine found a tremendous reality conveyed in that figurative language, and he uses

[1] This seems to mean the sacrament of Baptism, regarded as making men members of our Lord's body, and so in the former sentence, those "who have been washed, who have become partakers of His body," are one group of people, not two. It would seem that to Augustine to be baptized was "to eat the flesh of Christ and to drink His blood."

[2] *De Civitate* xxi. 19, 20, 25. Pusey, 532, 533. *P. L.* 41, 733, 734, 741.

such figurative language about a "body" of our Lord quite interchangeably with our Lord's eucharistic word, "body." Nay, I observe that he speaks of Catholics as eating the body of our Lord, "not sacramentally only, but in reality," when they are incorporated in the body mystical. Now S. Augustine is absolutely clear that those who receive the Holy Communion "unworthily," do receive our Lord's body, — to their condemnation and hurt. Apply this key, that S. Augustine regarded our Lord's eucharistic language as figurative, as truly as S. Paul's language about the body, the Church, and all comes clear. Our Lord calls the hallowed bread His body, because He has taken it as the vehicle and instrument of His Divine-human life. The wicked man really receives this body, with its indwelling life. He receives a figure, which is not a mere figure, but a great power. And yet he receives sacramentally only, but *not in reality*, that gift (of union with our Lord in His glorified body in heaven) which this *sacramental* body, a great reality in itself, was intended to convey.

Certainly Augustine holds our Lord's eucharistic language to be figurative language. Not only does our saint contrast what is done "sacramentally" with what is done "in reality." He speaks of our Lord as commending and delivering to His disciples "the figure of His own body and blood." (*Enarrations on the Psalms*, iii. 1.)[1] He speaks of our Lord as hesitating "not to say, 'This is My body,' when He gave a sign of His body." (*Contra Adimantum*, 12. § 3.)[2] Again, he says, "These things are therefore called sacraments, because in them one thing is seen, another is understood. What is seen has a bodily form; what is understood has a spiritual fruit." (*Sermon* 272.)[3]

[1] *P. L.* 36, 73. [2] *P. L.* 42, 144. [3] *P. L.* 38, 1247.

Of course, it will be said here by some devout modern students that the thing seen is bread, and the thing understood is our Lord's glorified body. But let me ask them to observe how different the language of Augustine is from theirs. *They* always distinguish the bread from our Lord's body. They do not really, when they are thinking their own thoughts, and using their natural language, call the eucharistic bread "our Lord's body." They say that the bread is a *figure* of our Lord's body natural, and that the body is *present* in the bread. S. Augustine, like all the rest of the Fathers, did call the consecrated bread our Lord's body, and did believe that our Lord had made it so, it being truly the body of our Lord in a new and figurative sense, which yet included a tremendous reality. That is the thought which enables Augustine to dwell so much on the fact (as he held it to be) that Judas received our Lord's body, and yet to write such a passage as this from the Treatise *On the City of God:*

"These persons (Christians who live in habitual sin) are not to be said to eat the body of Christ, for they cannot even be reckoned among His members. For not to mention other matters, they cannot be at once the members of Christ and the members of a harlot. In fine, He Himself, when He says, 'He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, abideth in Me, and I in Him,' shows what it is, not by way of sacrament, but in reality (*non sacramento tenus, sed re vera*), to eat His body, and drink His blood; for this is to abide in Christ, that He may also abide in us. For He hath so said this, as if He said, 'He that abideth in Me, and in whom I abide not, let him not say or think that he eateth My flesh, or drinketh My blood.'"[1]

The bread and wine are called the body and blood of Christ in a figure, because He enters into them, and

[1] *De Civitate,* xxi. 25 end; Pusey, 533, 534; *P. L.* 41, 742.

makes them a power for certain ends. This figure is in itself a great reality, filled with an awful power. That reality all communicants receive, for good or for evil. But really eating the flesh, and drinking the blood of the Lord, or in other words, truly carrying out his figure, according to its intended action, is to be said only of those who turn that great power to an appointed use, of blessing and newness of life.

I know no other explanation than that which I have given, which can clear Augustine of the charge of self-contradiction. He who thus tells us that the wicked "are not to be said to eat the body of the Lord," did use that very form of speech over and over. He said of Judas, that he "received Christ's body" [1] (*Tractate on S. John* lxii. 3. Pusey, 516), and again, "They ate the bread which was the Lord: he, the bread of the Lord, against the Lord. They ate life; he punishment." (*Tractate on S. John*, lix. 1.) Again, he speaks of certain offenders, who "fear not, with the mark of the devil, to receive the body of Christ." [2] Nothing could make it more clear that Augustine regarded the eucharistic elements themselves, received by good and bad alike as worthy to be called by great names, because they had received the indwelling of a great power. It is equally clear that Augustine regards these elements as fulfilling the promise implied in such great names to those only who fulfilled certain conditions. In other words, there was a great

[1] That is, he says of Judas receiving the sop, that he "did *not at that time* receive Christ's body," and goes on to show that that receiving happened earlier. The next quotation is ambiguous. It refers certainly to the receiving of the sop. Probably it refers to the communion of Judas also. The passages are in *P. L.* 35, 1802, and 35, 1796, respectively.

[2] *Ep.* 245, 2, *Ad Possidium.* Pusey, 508; *P. L.* 33. 1061.

reality there, but the names which it secured to the consecrated elements were figurative names, which might or might not, make their promise good.

What did S. Augustine hold to be the Inner Reality of the sacrament? Certainly, our Lord Himself. And it may be added, not our Lord in His glorified body, but our Lord in His glorious Person. I have said that Augustine nowhere speaks of our Lord's body as coming from heaven. He does speak often of our feeding on *bread* from heaven. But He invariably refers that phrase to our Lord personally, and not to our Lord's body. He speaks several times of our feeding on "the bread of angels," but he explains that phrase as referring to our Lord in His Divine Nature. He was the bread of angels, Augustine says, before His Incarnation. He could become the bread of *men* only by the way of Incarnation. Here is a passage from a sermon on Psalm 34 (in the Vulgate, 33):[1]

"In His own body and blood He willed our health to be. But whereby commended He His own body and blood? By His own humility. For unless He were humble, neither could this be eaten, nor that drunk. Consider His high estate: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' Behold! the food is from everlasting, but of it eat the angels, of it eat the heavenly spirits, and eating, they are filled. And yet remaineth that whole which satisfieth them, and maketh them glad. [So far the subject is our Lord's Person in His Divine Nature, exclusively.] But what man could be capable of that food? How could his heart be made fit enough for that food? Therefore it behooved that table to become milk, and so to come even to babes. But how doth food become milk? How is food changed into milk, except it is passed through flesh? For the mother does this thing: What

[2] *Serm.* i. 6. Pusey, 517–519; *P. L.* 36, 303.

the mother eats, that the infant eats, but because the infant is less fit to feed on bread, the same bread the mother incarnates, and through humility of her own breast, and the juice of milk, of that very food feeds the infant. How, then, did the Wisdom of God feed us with that same bread? 'The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.' See, then, humility, in the fact that man ate the bread of angels, as it is written, 'He gave them of the bread of heaven; man did eat angels' food'; that is, that Word, by which the angels live from everlasting, which is equal to the Father, did man eat; because 'being in the form of God He thought it not robbery to be equal with God,' by that (form) are the angels filled. But He 'made Himself of no reputation,' that man might eat angels' food, 'and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross,' that so from His cross might be commended to us the body and the blood of the Lord for a new sacrifice."

Again, in the *Tractates on S. John* (xxvi. 20), we have the same teaching:

"This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that by eating Him we may live, seeing we cannot have eternal life of ourselves. . . . Even they who eat Christ shall certainly die temporally, but they shall live for ever, because Christ is eternal life."[1]

The teaching is continued in the next *Tractate* (xxvii. 1):[2]

"He explained the mode of this bestowal and gift of His, in what manner He gave His flesh to eat, saying, 'He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him.' The proof that a man has eaten and drunk is this, if he abides and is abode in, if he dwells and is dwelt in, if he cleaves so as not to be abandoned. This, then, He has taught us, and admonishes us in mystical words, to be in His body, among His

[1] Pusey, 513; *P. L.* 35, 1615. [2] Pusey, 513; *P. L.* 35, 1616.

members, under Himself as Head, eating His flesh, not abandoning our unity with Him."

Pursuing this line of teaching, our saint adds (in *Tractate* xlv. 9, quoted in Pusey, 514–515) an assertion which may startle modern hearers. He says that the worthies of the Old Covenant received the same blessing that we do, that is, union with our Lord. I venture to doubt the correctness of S. Augustine's teaching in this particular point; but I value his words here as showing very strikingly what he held the Heavenly Part in the sacrament to be.

"Was not the same faith theirs by whom these signs were employed, and by whom were foretold in prophecy the things which we believe? Certainly it was. But they believed that they were yet to come; and we, that they have come. In like manner does he also say, 'They all drank the same spiritual drink.' 'The same spiritual,' for it was *not* the same material (drink). For what was it they drank? 'For they drank of the spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ.' See, then, how that while the faith remained the same, the signs were varied. The rock was Christ; to us that is Christ which is placed on the altar of God. And they, as a great sacramental sign of the same Christ, drank the water flowing from the rock; what we drink is known, is known to the faithful. If one's thoughts turn to the visible form, the thing is different; if to the meaning that addresses the understanding, they 'drank the same spiritual drink.'" [1]

I set it down confidently that S. Augustine never anywhere contrasts an earthly sacrament with a heavenly *body*, but always with a heavenly Person, or a heavenly Life. Let me give one more extract to this effect, and this time, from *Sermon* 131.[2]

[1] *P. L.* 35, 1723.

[2] Pusey, 527; Stone, 91, 92. *P. L.* 38, 729.

"What, then, does He answer? 'Does this make you stumble? What then if ye shall see the Son of Man ascending where He was before?' What does He mean by 'Does this make you stumble?' 'Do you think that of this body of Mine, which you see, I shall make pieces, and cut up My limbs, and give them to you?' What does He mean by 'If then you shall see the Son of Man ascending where He was before?' Certainly, He who could ascend whole, could not be consumed. Therefore He both gave to us healthful nourishment from His body and blood, and in a few words solved so great a question about His wholeness. Therefore let those who eat, eat, and let those who drink, drink; let them 'hunger and thirst'; let them eat life, let them drink life. To eat this is to be nourished; but so are you nourished that the source of your nourishment does not fail. To drink this, what is it but to live? Eat life, drink life; you will have life, and yet the life is whole. Then this will happen, that is, the body and blood of Christ will be life to each one, if what is visibly received in the sacrament is spiritually eaten, and spiritually drunk, in very truth."

In the quotation given above from the *Tractates on S. John* (xxvii. 1), we heard S. Augustine saying, "He explained first the mode of this bestowal and gift of His, . . . when He said, 'He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me and I in Him.'" Perhaps you could not see that those words of our Lord really constituted an *explanation* of those other great words, "This is My body," "This is My blood." S. Augustine makes it clear that he, for *his* part, did find there an "explanation," and one which satisfied his deeply philosophical mind. To him those words of our Lord seem to have meant, "This bread is now a means by which I can extend the reach of My human life, and bring it to bear upon My people, feeding them from Myself, and uniting them with Myself." "This wine is now a means whereby I may communicate Myself to My people as a quickening

Force, animating My body mystical, My Church, even as My natural blood, now flowing in My veins, animates My natural body." With such an understanding of our Lord's words, S. Augustine finds naturally in a phrase that defines eating our Lord's flesh and drinking His blood as amounting to a mutual indwelling of our Lord and His people, an "explanation" of our Lord's mysterious saying.

Let me present, in this connection, an example of this great bishop, and clear-headed teacher, setting himself to explain the mystery of the Blessed Eucharist to beginners in the Christian Religion, so far, that is, as it can be explained at all. The most noteworthy thing about this offered explanation is, that it does not follow the line that a modern Roman theologian would follow, nor the line that a modern High Anglican would follow, *in the very least*, and the next most noteworthy thing about it is that neither of these modern theologians can easily find any "explanation" here *at all*. The passage which I am to quote is from a sermon to children (*Sermon* cclxxii. Quoted by Stone, p. 95, and, in part, by Pusey, p. 530.) I ask you to notice that their bishop has nothing to say to them about our Lord's body being able to be in heaven and on the altar at the same time, being present among us after the manner of a spirit. If he had thought that, I know no reason why he should not have said it, but every reason why he should, when his particular object was to explain our Lord's eucharistic Presence just as far as it could possibly be explained. But if you listen to his explanation, which he did give, with that other thought in your mind, — that our Lord must have meant by "This is My body," "This also is My body in some sense, another body, which I have besides My body natural," then I think that you can see that the

bishop's words do constitute something of an explanation. Here, at any rate is what he says:

"This which you see on the altar of God, you saw last night, also; but what it was, what it meant, of how great a thing it contained the sacrament, you have not yet heard. What you see, then, is bread and a cup, which even your eyes declare to you; but as to that in which your faith demands instruction, the bread is the body of Christ, the cup, the blood of Christ. . . . Such a thought as this may occur in some one's mind: our Lord Jesus Christ, — we know whence He received flesh, of the Virgin Mary. As a babe He was nourished, suckled, grew. . . . He was slain. . . . He rose again. . . . He ascended into heaven. . . . There He is now sitting at the right hand of the Father. How is the bread His body? How is the cup, or that which the cup contains, His blood? Brethren, these things are called sacraments for this reason, that in them one thing is seen, another thing is understood. That which is seen has bodily appearance (*speciem*); that which is understood has spiritual fruit. If you wish to understand the body of Christ, hear the Apostle, speaking to the faithful, 'Now ye are the body and members of Christ.' If you, then, are the body and members of Christ, your mystery is laid on the Table of the Lord, your mystery you receive. To that which you are you answer *Amen*, and in answering you assent. You hear the words, 'The body of Christ,' and you answer '*Amen*.' Be a member of the body of Christ, that the '*Amen*' may be true." [1]

Now if S. Augustine had believed that the bread of the Eucharist was (1) not our Lord's body at all, but (2) called so, because it was a picture of our Lord's body, being also (3) an appointed sign and pledge of the presence of our Lord's heavenly body, he would have said so plainly. If, again, these catechumens were asking, "How can our Lord's heavenly body be here on the altar?" to tell them that in a sacrament one thing is

[1] *P. L.* 36, 1246–1248.

seen, and another understood, would have been simply to re-state the difficulty with which their minds were occupied, and not in the least to explain it. But once more let me substitute my pre-supposition, which I suppose to have been S. Augustine's, and that of everybody else in his time. These people, who looked to him for instruction, were not asking "How can our Lord's body, which is in heaven, be here on the altar, too?" They were asking, "How, since we know that our Lord's body is in heaven, and not here, can this bread of His sacrament be His body, too?" Then Augustine's answer will make sense. And its sense will be something like this. "The words used in defining the grace of a sacrament are used in a special, not an ordinary, way. When bread is called 'the body of the Lord,' and wine 'the blood of the Lord,' you know that these hallowed elements have suffered a change, and have in them some mysterious potency, some spiritual fruit, beyond their outward seeming. Would you ask how bread can have the potency of a 'body' for our Lord, bethink yourselves of how He teaches us to call the Church His 'body' because He lives in it and works through it." To tell them that in these sacramental phrases words are not used literally, and to point them to another well-known and well-loved use of one of these words in a figurative way, *is* to give them at least the beginning of an explanation that explains. I venture to say that an explanation of Augustine's own meaning as the preacher of this sermon must be looked for along the line which I have just indicated.

I keep insisting that to S. Augustine and his hearers the natural suggestion of "This is My body," was "This is a body which is Mine, and is in addition to that in which I stand before you." I want to give some further passages which seem to me to establish that that was the

attitude of Augustine's mind. I begin with two which can be easily explained otherwise, but which will gather force from those which follow after.

In that sermon on Psalm 34 (*Sermon* i. 10), which I have already quoted, I find this:

"Christ was carried in His own hands, when delivering His own body, He said, 'This is My body.' For *that body* He carried in His own hands." [1]

It will be said by some that my emphasizing "*that body*" does not truly represent the preacher's mind. Then I will quote from his *second* sermon (*Sermon* ii. 2) on this same psalm, a passage which comes nearer to saying clearly what I understand him to mean:

"When He delivered His own body and His own blood, He took in His hands what the faithful know, and *in a certain fashion* [*quodam modo*] *He carried Himself*, when He said, 'This is My body.'" [2]

If it be held that still I have not proved that S. Augustine thought of that eucharistic body as "another body," I will call him as a witness to his own belief that Christians *do not eat our Lord's body natural.* Thus in the first sermon on Psalm 34 (*Sermon* i. 8; Pusey, 519) we find this:

"Recollect the Gospel! When our Lord Jesus Christ spake concerning His body, He said 'Except a man eat My flesh, and drink My blood, he shall have no life in him. For My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed.' And His disciples who followed Him feared, and were shocked at His discourse; and understanding it not, they thought that our Lord Jesus Christ said some hard thing, as if they were to eat His flesh, and drink His blood, which they saw; and could not endure it, saying, 'How is it?'" [3]

[1] Stone, 82; *P. L.* 36, 306. [2] *P. L.* 36, 308. [3] *P. L.* 36, 305.

Of course, it will be urged by some that when S. Augustine implied that, of course, our Lord's followers were *not* to eat His flesh, and drink His blood, *which they saw*, he only intended to say that they were not to eat of that body *as* they saw it, that is, in its natural state. But it seems to me that this is to charge a great saint and great teacher with using words somewhat carelessly and clumsily. If he had meant that other thing it would have been quite as easy to say so. Two more brief extracts will make it absolutely sure, I think, that S. Augustine did not regard the eucharistic body of our Lord as identical with His body natural in any wise. We have heard Augustine representing our Lord as "carrying Himself in His own hands, *in a certain fashion*." We shall find that cautious phrase coming out in one of the most famous of Augustinian sayings. It comes from *Epistle* xcviii. 9.[1]

"If the sacraments had not any likeness to those things of which they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all. And from this likeness for the most part also they receive the names of the things themselves. As then, after a certain fashion [*secundum quemdam modum*] the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, and the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ, so the sacrament of faith is faith."

I think that if S. Augustine had been writing in our modern English speech he would have preferred the word "analogy" to the word "likeness." The resemblance that he has in his mind is a "resemblance of ratios." That is exactly what I am claiming. He seems to have regarded the eucharistic bread as being to our Lord in one sphere what His body of flesh and bones had been

[2] Pusey, 507; Stone, 65; *P. L.*, 33, 364.

to Him in another sphere. Because of that analogy, it is proper to give it that name of "body," too.

My second brief passage is from the *Treatise on Christian Doctrine* (iii. 16; Stone, 65). Here is Augustine's rule for declaring what is to be taken as figurative, and what as literal, in Holy Scripture:

"If the sentence is one of command, either forbidding a crime or vice, or enjoining an act of prudence or benevolence, it is not figurative. If, however, it seems to enjoin a crime or vice, or to forbid an act of prudence or benevolence, it is figurative. 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man,' says Christ, 'and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.' This seems to enjoin a crime or a vice; therefore it is a figure, enjoining that we should have a share in the sufferings of our Lord, and a sweet and profitable memory of the fact that His flesh was wounded and crucified for us." [1]

Now, certainly, S. Augustine believed a great deal more concerning the sacrament than these words of his would suggest to a modern reader. But when we read those passages in which he expresses that "more," we must never forget that in this one point he has put himself on record unalterably. The words, "This is My body," "This is My blood," are figurative expressions, not literal, and his distinction between "figurative" and "literal" is exactly the same which we make to-day.

I wish to close my examination of the teaching of S. Augustine with a long quotation, in which our Lord will be represented as saying, "You are not to eat that body which you see, nor to drink that blood which they who shall crucify Me will pour forth." But before I proceed to that closing testimony as to Augustine's non-literalness, I must make the most distinct acknowledgment that this same great teacher regards the sacramental body of

[1] *P. L.* 34, 745.

our Lord as something to be identified with His body natural, and does, therefore, with an appearance of flattest self-contradiction, assert over and over that men do eat and drink the body and blood of our Lord, which He wore here on earth. I must remind you of the distinction which I drew in my first Lecture and again in my fourth Lecture between "identified" and "identical." Augustine distinctly declines to acknowledge the sacramental body of our Lord as *identical* with His natural body, and yet he identifies the two bodies in some sense. I note further that this identification is always an identification with the body of our Lord's earthly life, and never with the body as glorified. The latter identification could have been made just as well, on the same theological foundation. Only our saint's thoughts never seem to turn that way. He thinks rather of the body on the altar as in some sense one with the body which suffered and was rejected here on earth. Here are the passages:

"Those men, indeed, [the Jews] saw Christ dying by their own villany, and yet they believed Christ pardoning their villanies. Until they drank the blood they shed, they despaired of their own salvation."[1]

"What murderer should despair if one was restored to hope, by whom even Christ was murdered? There believed of them many. They were presented with Christ's blood as a gift, that they might drink it for their deliverance, rather than be held guilty of shedding it. Who can despair?" (*Ibid.* xxxviii. 7.)

"That blood which in their rage they shed, in their faith they drank." (*Ibid.* xl. 2.)

But from these examples of one of Augustine's habits of mind, identifying, in a fashion, the "blood" of the

[1] *Tractate on S. John,* xxxi. 9; Pusey, 514; *P. L.* 35, 1640. The next two passages are on col. 1678 and col. 1684.

Eucharist with the blood of our Lord's natural body, I turn back to my promised quotation, drawn from the *Enarrations on the Psalms* (xcix. [in the Vulgate, xcviii.] 8).[1] Augustine is here commenting on the words in the fifth verse of the Psalm, which we read in our Prayer Books as "fall down before His footstool, for He is holy." The King James Version gives, "worship at His footstool." Augustine read in his Latin Bible, *adorate scabellum pedum ejus; quoniam sanctus est*, — "worship His footstool; for He is holy." The difficulty arose at once to Latin readers, how could men be bidden to worship a created thing? Augustine explains by referring to the saying, "Earth is My footstool" (Is. lxvi. 1; Acts vii. 49), and then to the fact that man is said to have been made out "of the dust of the ground" (Gen. ii. 7). Earth is made man. Our Lord takes man's nature upon Him. Then earth, which is God's footstool, is found to be part of the vesture of the Eternal Word. God's footstool is made worshipful, when of it is made the flesh of Christ. Here follows the quotation:

"Because He walked here in flesh itself, and gave flesh itself [2] to us to eat for our salvation, and no one eats that flesh, unless he has first worshipped, a way has been found in which such a footstool of the Lord may be worshipped, and in which we not only do not sin if we worship, but should sin if we did not worship. But doth the flesh give life? Our Lord Himself, when He was speaking in praise of this same earth, said, 'It is the Spirit

[1] Pusey, 521–523; Stone 108–109; *P. L.* 37, 1264.

[2] The translator for the Oxford Library of the Fathers here renders "that very flesh" as if S. Augustine had written "*illam carnem ipsam.*" Dr. Darwell Stone's rendering, "He walked here in the flesh itself, and gave the flesh itself" is, of course, perfectly possible, but the rendering above seems nearer to Augustine's sequence of thought. Augustine did at times identify the eucharistic body and the historic body, as we have seen. He is not making that point here.

that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.' Therefore when thou bowest thyself down prostrate before the earth, look not unto the earth; look not as if unto the earth, but unto that Holy One whose footstool it is that thou dost worship. Wherefore He hath added here also, 'Worship His footstool, for He is holy.' Who is holy? He in whose honor thou dost worship His footstool. And when thou worshippest Him, see that thou do not in thought remain in the flesh, unquickened by the Spirit; for He saith, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.' But when our Lord counselled this, He had been speaking of His own flesh, and had said, 'Except a man eat My flesh, he shall have no life in him.' Some disciples of His, about seventy,[1] were offended, and said, 'This is a hard saying. Who can hear it?' And they went back, and walked no more with Him. It seemed to them hard that He said, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you.' They received it foolishly, they thought of it carnally, they even imagined that the Lord would cut off parts from His body, and give to them; and they said, 'This is a hard saying.' *They* were hard, not the saying; for unless they had been hard, and not meek, they would have said to themselves, 'He does not say this without reason, but there must be some latent mystery therein;' they would have remained with Him, softened, not hard, and would have learned that from Him which they did learn who remained after the others had departed. For when, on their departure, twelve disciples had remained, these remaining followers suggested to Him, as if in grief for the death of the former, that these were offended by His words, and turned back. But He instructed them, and saith unto them, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken unto you, they are Spirit, and they are life. Understand spiritually what I have said: *you are not to eat this body which you see, nor drink that blood which they who shall crucify Me*

[1] This is a curious example of exegesis by the way of inference. Our Lord's disciples left Him so largely that he asked the Twelve if *they* were going too. Those who had gone already must, then, have been the next most intimate group, "the seventy"!

will pour forth. I have delivered unto you a certain mystery. Spiritually understood, it will quicken. Although it is needful that this be visibly celebrated, yet it must be spiritually understood.' 'Oh! magnify the Lord our God; and worship His footstool; for He is holy.'"

I might multiply quotations, but I forbear. I close with two claims. I claim that S. Augustine continually uses such phrases as my understanding of his eucharistic belief calls for. You may explain every one of them so as to satisfy yourself entirely that it will *bear* another interpretation, and can be made to fit with another habit of speech. It remains that it is his habit to use such words and phrases as with my general view of the patristic teaching I should expect. I claim, secondly, that the language which some modern theorists find most natural is language which S. Augustine never uses at all.

II

The Testimony of S. Jerome, the Traveller (A.D. 346?–420)

The learned scholar, Jerome, is exceptional among the Fathers of the Church for the wide range of his associations with men as well as for the largeness of his studies. Born in the Roman province of Pannonia (east of the northern part of the Adriatic Sea) he studied at Rome, in Gaul, in Asia Minor, at Antioch, at Alexandria. In later life he had a few years at Rome in the commanding position of secretary to the Bishop, Damasus, and then a much longer career as head of a group of religious houses at Bethlehem. No man of his day knew better what Christian thought was, no man was quicker to detect differences of thought among students, than this

Jerome, whose almost ecumenical experience and observation I have tried to sum up in a phrase by calling him "Jerome, the Traveller." Because of this extraordinary largeness of experience he represents much more than himself. If it be suggested that that is true of almost any Christian scholar, I will say that, *much more than most other* Christian writers, S. Jerome represents more than himself. That fact of his life would certainly tend to save him from putting forth peculiar, individual, and novel opinions and teachings. If S. Jerome introduces us to an exceptional word, it will be particularly likely that his exceptional way of speaking will yet represent most justly, if the subject be one of the subjects near to the Church's heart, and always prominent in the Church's thought, what the Church had been thinking in regard to that same subject for three hundred years. And in connection with this great subject of the Eucharist, S. Jerome does introduce us to a new phrase. He speaks over and over of "making" the body of our Lord in the sacrament.

This phrase ought to be startling to theologians of the modern pre-possession. Our Lord's glorified body in heaven needs not to be *made*, nor can be. Our Lord's body in which He stood before the Apostles, when He consecrated His first Eucharist, needed not to be made, nor could be. But according to the view that I have been pressing, the making of the eucharistic bread to be our Lord's body does include and imply the making of a new body. That idea, and that only, can account reasonably, and without straining of human speech, for such an expression as that the Priest makes (*conficit*) the body of Christ. I shall begin my quotations from S. Jerome with one in which he may give his answer — I think that he does give a clear answer — to the question

whether, in his thoughts about the sacrament of the altar, our Lord is understood to have another body besides His natural body. Jerome is here commenting on Eph. i. 7, "In whom we have redemption through His blood," and he is led to compare some legendary heathen deliverers of their people with our Lord, the Saviour of a whole world by His blood-shedding. Then he goes on thus:

"But the blood and flesh of Christ are understood in two ways, either that spiritual and divine (flesh), of which He said Himself, 'My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed,' and 'Except ye eat My flesh, and drink My blood, ye shall not have eternal life,' or the flesh and blood of which the one was crucified, and the other was shed by the soldier's spear. According to this distinction there is a difference of blood and flesh to be understood in the case of His saints as well, so that there is one flesh which is to see the salvation of God, and another flesh and blood which cannot possess the Kingdom of God." [1]

Now when Jerome approaches this great subject with the idea that the flesh and blood of our Lord are to be understood in two ways, that two distinct realities may be called by these great names, one "flesh and blood" being spiritual and another literal, it should be no surprise to find him going on to such phrases as

"Wine is consecrated into the blood of Christ," [2]

and again,

"Far be it from me to say anything offensive of these persons [the clergy], seeing that they, succeeding to the Apostolic office, do with consecrated lips make the body of Christ, and by their act [in administering Baptism] we are Christians," [3]

[1] Stone, 97, 98; Pusey, 482; *P. L.* 26, 481.
[2] *Com. on Gal.* v. 19; Pusey, 582; *P. L.* 26, 445.
[3] *Epistola* xiv., *ad Heliodorum;* Pusey, 582; *P. L.* 22, 352.

and again, when commenting on the robes of the Jewish High Priest, and their Christian meaning,

"A Pontiff and Bishop, ready to offer sacrifices for the people, a mediator between men and God, and making with consecrated lips the flesh of the Lamb [*carnes Agni sacro ore conficiens*], because the holy oil of Christ his God is upon him," [1]

and again, when rebuking the pride of the seven deacons of the city of Rome,

"What ails the minister of tables and widows, that he swells and lifts himself up above those [the presbyters] at whose prayers the body and blood of Christ are brought into being." [2]

We have seen that S. Jerome distinguishes two kinds of "flesh and blood" of our Lord, one which is (literally) flesh and blood, and one which is bread and wine. How utterly he identifies the eucharistic bread with the eucharistic body may be seen in sundry passages of his writings. I take first his comment on the phrase of the prophet Malachi, "Ye offer polluted bread upon Mine altar."

"We pollute bread, that is, the body of Christ, when, being unworthy, we approach the altar, and, being impure, drink pure blood." [3]

In like manner we have in his *Enarrationes Hebraicae* on Genesis xiv. 18 (Pusey, 478) the phrase, "offering bread and wine, that is, the body and blood of the Lord Jesus." [4] And in his *Commentary on Ezekiel* xliii. (Pusey, 479) he quotes from S. Paul's words to the Corinthians, "Let a man prove himself; and so let him eat of the bread, and

[1] *Ep. lxiv. 5, Ad Fabiolam:* Pusey, 476; *P. L.* 22, 611.
[2] *Ep. cxlvi., Ad Evangelum;* Pusey, 476; *P. L.* 22, 1193.
[3] *Com. on Malachi* i. 7; Pusey, 481; *P. L.* 25, 1624.
[4] *P. L.* 23, 1011.

drink of the cup" (1 Cor. xi. 28), and makes a striking substitution, as of equivalent meaning, —

"Whence the Apostle says: 'Let a man prove his own self, and so let him approach *the body and blood of the Lord.*'" [1]

I will add one more such passage, this time from his *Commentary on Isaiah* (Is. lxii. 9; Pusey, 472):

"This is the wheat, and this the wine, of which none shall eat, save those who praise the Lord, and none shall drink, except in His holy courts, of which the Lord said in His passion, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, I will no more drink of this fruit of the vine, until I drink it new in the Kingdom of My Father,' which words are partly fulfilled in the Church. . . . Wheat, also, whereof heavenly bread is made, that is, whereof the Lord speaketh: 'My flesh is meat indeed,' and again of wine, 'My blood is drink indeed.'" [2]

Certainly to Jerome the bread and wine of the altar are themselves, very really and unquestionably, our Lord's body and blood. I may add that he has the same thought on which Augustine was to dwell so habitually, that we Christians are ourselves "the body of the Lord," equally really, equally unquestionably. In his commentary, if it be really his, on 1 Cor. xi. (a passage not quoted by Dr. Pusey) he quotes S. John vi. 56, and draws out a moving consequence:

"'He abides in Me, and I in him.' Whence every one that either eats Christ's body or drinks Christ's blood should bethink himself of what he is, that he do no wrong to Him *whose body he has been made to be.*" [3]

Does S. Jerome ever speak of our Lord's heavenly body as present in the sacrament? I venture to assert that he does not. But I will quote two passages, which

[1] *P. L.* 25, 436. [2] *P. L.* 24, 63. [3] *P. L.* 30, 783.

may seem to carry that meaning in the eyes of some theologians of the modern pre-supposition, as a matter of presenting evidence fairly.

The first is from his *Letter to Hedibia* (*Ep.* cxx.):[1]

"If, then, the 'bread which came down from heaven,' is the Lord's body, and the wine which He gave to His disciples is the blood of the new covenant," etc.

We have seen that to S. Augustine "the bread which comes down from heaven" is always our Lord in His Divine-human Person. It is never His heavenly *body*. The bread which He gives us from the altar may be described as "bread from heaven," because He who is the true "bread from heaven" dwells in it, without necessarily supposing the presence of His heavenly body.

The other passage is from the commentary on S. Matt. xxvi., and runs thus:

"After that the typical Passover was finished, and He had eaten the flesh of the lamb with His apostles, He takes bread, which strengthens the heart of man, and passes to the true paschal sacrament; that as Melchizedek, priest of the Most High God, had done in profiguration of Him, He might do in present act in the verity of His own body and blood."[2]

Of course, if one starts with the assumption that our Lord can have but one body, this is decisive. That body is in the sacrament, and is there in its verity. But I protest that that assumption is not a sound one. I protest further that the view of the eucharistic Presence which I am here offering as that of the ancient Church regards the eucharistic body of our Lord as quite as much a "verity," and quite as much "His own," as the blessed body in the heavenly places. S. Jerome himself

[1] Pusey, 472; *P. L.* 22, 986. [2] Pusey, 482; *P. L.* 26, 202, 203.

has distinguished for us two meanings of such words as "the flesh and blood of the Lord," one spiritual, and one literal. He would not have allowed any man to tell him that when he said "spiritual" he must be meaning "unreal."

LECTURE VI

THE GREAT WRITERS BETWEEN THE SECOND AND THIRD GENERAL COUNCILS

B. The Greek Fathers

I

S. John Chrysostom, Pre-eminent Orator (A.D. 347–407)

WHEN we approach the testimony of S. Chrysostom, we find ourselves in a different atmosphere from any that we have known before. To some minds the change of atmosphere will represent a change of theology. I think that that is a mistake. Great orators and great poets take up the common material of thought as they find it around them in their day, and make new atmospheres for men. Sometimes they make the world seem a different place to men. In a sense, then, they may be said to think new thoughts. But most often, and most largely, they press upon men what men were already possessed of, only they present it with a new vividness and a new ardor. Old views seen with a new vision are their gift to the duller world around them. With the orator, especially, whose business is to persuade men to new action, it is absolutely necessary that he have a common ground with his hearers, a foundation of a common thought. An innovator cannot be an orator. You may think that you know of many examples to disprove that statement. But think again!

No man who seems to *you* an innovator will carry you far with him as an orator. The orator who really moves men must talk to them of things which they already believe.

But the orator has his element of newness. He strains language to the uttermost to work on the emotions of his hearers. The poet is less bound than the orator to saying only what men already think, or are all ready to think. Indeed, the poet may be a prophet, bringing men visions altogether new to them. He will not get a hearing readily, if he does bring them such new visions. But so far as the poet presents old thoughts, he will strain language, if he be a great poet, to make it hold a greater depth and height of thought. I think that S. Augustine shows more of that quality, of making language serve as an instrument of deepening and heightening thought, than our great S. John of Constantinople. It is intensity of feeling, rather than newness of thinking, that marks the orator of the mouth of gold. But certainly he strains language. Every reader of S. Chrysostom must see that. I will begin my quotations with two examples of the impassioned orator. Afterward we will consider the elements of his reasoned theology. I take the first of these extracts from the treatise on the Priesthood.[1]

"When thou seest the Lord sacrificed, and laid upon the altar, and the priest standing and praying over the victim, and all [the people] reddened with that precious blood, canst thou then think that thou art still among men, and standing upon the earth? Art thou not, on the contrary, straightway translated to heaven, and dost thou not cast out every carnal thought from thy soul, and with disembodied spirit and pure reason contemplate the things of heaven? Oh! what a marvel! Oh! what love of God to man! He who sitteth on high with the

[1] *De Sacerdotio*, iii. 4; Pusey, 545; *P. G.* 48, 641.

Father is at that hour held in the hands of all, and gives Himself to those who are willing to embrace and grasp Him. . . . There stands the priest, not calling down fire from heaven, but the Holy Spirit; and he makes prolonged supplication, not that some flame sent down from on high may consume the offering, but that grace descending on the sacrifice may hereby enlighten the souls of all, and render them more refulgent than silver purified by fire."

Some of this is very unliteral, certainly. Yet even in this rhapsody, I ask you to observe, our saint does not represent our Lord's body as coming from heaven. He describes the "inward part" of the sacrament as "grace" simply. If he had seen with the eyes of his vivid faith the body on the heavenly throne coming to be present on the altar, would he have failed to rhapsodize on a point so obviously suggestive to the orator's instinct for thrilling effects?

I take another example of rhapsody, in which the same opportunity is missed again, amid much of straining for effect, from the *Homilies on S. Matthew.*

"How many now say, 'I would wish to see His form, the mark, His clothes, His shoes.' Lo! thou seest Him, thou touchest Him, thou eatest Him. And thou indeed desirest to see His clothes, but He giveth Himself to thee, not to see only, but also to touch, and eat, and receive within thee. . . . Consider, how indignant thou art against the traitor, against them that crucified Him. Look, therefore, lest thou also thyself become guilty of the body and blood of Christ. They slaughtered the all-holy body, but thou after such great benefits receivest it in a filthy soul. For neither was it enough for Him to be made man, to be smitten and slaughtered, but He also commingleth Himself with us, and not by faith only, but also in very deed maketh us His body. What, then, ought not he to exceed in purity, that hath the benefit of this sacrifice, than what sunbeam should not that hand be more white which is to

sever this flesh, the mouth that is filled with spiritual fire, the tongue that is reddened by that most awful blood? Consider with what sort of honor thou wast honored, of what sort of table thou art partaking. That which when angels behold, they tremble, and dare not so much as to look up at it without awe on account of the brightness that cometh thence, with this we are fed, with this we are commingled, and we are made one body and one flesh with Christ." [1]

I have given an example of Chrysostom the orator; I turn to Chrysostom the theologian. He has a theology underlying all his rhetoric, and I think that it is not obscure. He is no Virtualist. As we have seen in the last extract, he regards the sacraments as working their great effects, "not by faith only, but in very deed." No one can surpass S. John Chrysostom in warning men that sacraments received amiss do no good, but rather harm. But he holds that they do in every case something. They are powers from God. Further, like the Fathers before him, S. John Chrysostom holds that the bread and wine of the Eucharist *are* the body and blood of our Lord. He does not say that they form a shrine for our Lord's body and blood, and therefore bear the names of those greater things. No! He represents the material elements of the sacrament as being the material also of our Lord's sacramental body and blood. I give two extracts from the *Homilies on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, to show that Chrysostom regarded the bread as our Lord's body, and our Lord's (sacramental) body as actually broken in the Eucharist:

"'The bread which we break is it not a communion of the body of Christ?' Wherefore said He not 'the participation'? Because he intended to express something more, and to point out how close was the union, in that we communicate not only by

[1] *Hom.* lxxxii. 4, 5; Pusey, 570–572; *P. G.* 58, 743, 744.

participating and partaking, but also by being united. For as that body is united to Christ, so also are we united to Him by this bread.

But why adds he also, 'which we break?' For although in the Eucharist one may see this done, yet on the cross not so. For, 'A bone of Him,' saith one, 'shall not be broken.' But that which He suffered not on the cross, this He suffers in the oblation for thy sake, and submits to be broken, that He may fill all men. . . .

For what is the bread? The body of Christ. And what do they become who partake of it? The body of Christ: not many bodies, but one body. For as the bread consisting of many grains is made one, so that the grains nowhere appear, — they exist, indeed, but their difference is not seen by reason of their conjunction, — so are we conjoined both with each other and with Christ, there not being one body for thee, and another body for thy neighbor to be nourished by, but one body for all." [1]

"Do not cut thyself off from thy neighbor, since Christ for His part gave equally to all, saying, 'Take, eat.' He gave His body equally, but dost not thou give so much as the common bread equally? Yea, it was indeed broken for all alike, and became the body for all."

We have seen in the former of the above extracts a reference to the undoubted fact that while our Lord embodies Himself in many men and women, His members, yet His body is not many, but one. Correspondingly, our Lord's body in many Eucharists is one. Wherever He embodies Himself, and *however* He may embody Himself, whether in His natural flesh, or in the bread and wine of the Eucharist, or in thousands of disciples who have received His Baptism, and so have "put on Christ," all His embodiments make up but one body together. Because we are in Him, according to S. Paul's doctrine,

[1] *Hom. in 1 Cor.* xxiv; Pusey, 580; *P. G.* 61, 199. Next passage, *P. G.* 61, 229.

we are in the body that is enthroned in heaven, — our "life is hid with Christ in God." Chrysostom felt that oneness of our Lord's body deeply. I give one extract (from his *Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews*), to illustrate that conviction of his, and then I shall go on to some consequences that come from it in his thought and speech.

"We always offer the same One (τὸν Αὐτὸν), not one sheep now, and tomorrow another, but always the same thing (τὸ αὐτό), so that the sacrifice is one. And yet, by this reasoning, since the offering is made in many places, are there many Christs? But Christ is one everywhere, being complete here and complete there also, one body. As, then, while offered in many places, He is one body, and not many bodies, so also He is one sacrifice." [1]

Starting with the idea that all our Lord's embodiments are so many forms of one body, Chrysostom naturally identifies the sacramental body of our Lord with the body of His earthly life, and even with His glorified body in heaven. In speaking of the theology of S. Augustine (p. 136) I pointed out that that great man identified the eucharistic body with the body of our Lord's earthly life, but never with the body in heaven. I said then that the latter identification might perfectly well have been made also, on Augustine's principles. I will now add that the fact that we meet with no such identification till we find it in the passionate oratory of Chrysostom, nearly four hundred years after the Church's beginning of thought and feeling, is a very striking fact indeed. My own way of accounting for that really remarkable slowness of development would be this: the Church had started out with a clear and strong impression that the body of our Lord in the Eucharist was a different body

[1] *Hom. in Heb.* xvii. 3; Pusey, 596–597; *P. G.* 63, 131.

from His natural body glorified in the heavenly places. While the Church felt deeply that the body of the altar was *one with* the body in glory, the Church felt just as deeply that the body of the altar was *not the same as* the body in glory. Because our Lord's body in all its forms is one, what was true of the body of the altar could be said, non-literally, but deeply truly, of His body of His earthly life and death, and also of His body of the heavenly life. But for some centuries the Church felt the difference between the body of the altar and the body in glory, *as a matter of literal fact*, too deeply to use language that could at all seem to contradict that literal fact. In all those years this identification might have been made. It involved no new theology, when it *was* made. It waited for the orator of the golden mouth to *be* made. And yet the number of these identifications is surprisingly small. I proceed to give three examples of the more common identification, of the body of the altar with the body which was crucified. The first is from the book on the *Betrayal of Judas*.[1]

"And Judas was present when Christ said this. This is the body which thou didst sell, O Judas, for thirty pieces of silver; this is the blood for which, a little while before, thou madest that shameless compact with the reckless Pharisees. Oh! the love of Christ for man! Oh! the frenzy, the madness of Judas! For Judas sold Him for thirty pieces of silver, but Christ, even after this, refused not to give the very blood which was sold, for the remission of sins, to him who sold it, if he willed."

The second and third passages are both from a homily before quoted:

"This, which is in the cup, is that which flowed from His side, and of that do we partake." . . .

[1] *De Proditione Judae*, i. 6; Pusey, 555; *P. G.* 49, 380.

"For if one would not inconsiderately receive a king, — why say I, a king? Nay, were it but a royal robe, one would not inconsiderately touch it with unclean hands, — though he should be in solitude, though alone, though no man were at hand; . . . if even a man's garment be what one would not venture inconsiderately to touch, what shall we say of the body of Him who is God over all, spotless, pure, associate with the Divine Nature, the body whereby we are and live, whereby the gates of hell were broken down, and the archways of heaven opened? How shall we receive this with so great insolence? Let us not, I pray you, slay ourselves by our irreverence, but with all awfulness and purity, draw nigh to it; and when thou seest it set before thee, say thou to thyself, 'Because of this body I am no longer earth and ashes, no longer a prisoner, but free, because of this I hope for heaven, and to receive the good things therein, — immortal life, the portion of angels, converse with Christ. This body, nailed and scourged, was more than hell could stand against; this body the very sun saw sacrificed, and turned away its beams; for this both the veil was rent, in that moment, and the rocks were burst asunder, and all the earth was shaken. This is even that body, the blood-stained, the pierced, and that out of which gushed the saving fountains, the one of blood, and the other of water, for all the world.'" [1]

The identification of the sacramental body with the heavenly body is (as I have said above) even with Chrysostom very rare, but here are two examples of it. The first is from the homily last quoted:

"Open only for once the gates of heaven, and look in, nay, rather, not of heaven, but of the heaven of heavens, and then thou wilt behold what I have been speaking of. For what is of all things most precious there, this will I show thee lying upon the earth. For as in royal palaces what is most glorious of all is not walls, nor golden roofs, but the person of the king sitting on the throne, so likewise in heaven, the body of the King. But

[1] *Hom. in 1 Cor.* xxiv. 3–7; Pusey, 579, 582; *P. G.* 61, 199, 202.

this thou art now permitted to see upon earth. For it is not angels, nor archangels, nor heavens, and heaven of heavens, that I show thee, but the very Lord and Owner of these. Perceivest thou how that which is more precious than all things is seen by thee on earth, and not seen only, but also touched, and not only touched, but likewise eaten, and after receiving it thou goest home." [1]

The next extract will combine the two identifications, with the body crucified, and with the body glorified. It comes from the *Homilies on the Epistle to the Ephesians:*

"Since we are concerned with the Lord's body, come, and let us turn our thoughts to it, even that which was crucified, which was nailed, which is sacrificed. . . . Since we have to do with a body, consider that so many of us as partake of the body, so many of us as taste of this blood, do partake of that which is in no wise different from that body, nor separate [as regards participation], that we taste of that body, the same which sitteth above, the same which is worshipped by angels, the same which is next to the Power that is indefectible. Alas! How many ways to salvation are open to us! He hath made us His own body, He hath imparted to us His own body, and yet naught of these things turns us away from what is evil!" [2]

I have said that in these identifications of the sacramental body of our Lord with His body natural, on earth or in heaven, S. Chrysostom did not expect to be taken literally. Some critics will enquire, with a certain scorn, by what right I set aside such utterances as "non-literal." My plea in rebuttal has three divisions. First, Chrysostom certainly has the non-literal habit. We have heard S. Jerome saying that the priest with hallowed lips makes the body of Christ. Chrysostom would have approved that saying entirely, we may be sure, but to enforce a

[1] *Hom. in 1 Cor.* xxiv. 8; Pusey, 590; *P. G.* 61, 205.
[2] *Hom. in Eph.* iii; Pusey, 590; *P. G.* 62, 27.

different point he says (in his *Homilies on 2 Timothy* (*Hom.* ii. 3), that the priest's part "is but to open his mouth, while God worketh all. The priest only performs a symbol." So again he says (*De Proditione Judae*, i. 6), "It is not man that makes what lieth there to become the body and blood of Christ", and again (in the *Homily for Pentecost*, i. 4), "he that is present doeth nothing, nor are the gifts that lie before us any accomplishments of human nature." [1] These passages are not to be taken as contradicting S. Jerome in the least. Of course, S. Chrysostom regarded the priest at the altar as doing something, and a very great thing. But he loved exaggerated and non-literal expressions of great truths.

My second point is that S. Chrysostom must be taken non-literally in the expressions which I have indicated, when he identifies the sacramental body of our Lord with His natural body, or else he will contradict the theology of all the Fathers who have testified before him, and that is an inadmissible suggestion for these two reasons: (1) he is plainly unconscious of advancing any new theology of the Eucharist, and (2) his contemporaries did not charge him with having done any such thing.

My third point is that to take Chrysostom literally in such identifications is to make him inconsistent with *himself*. I go back to my second example of Chrysostom the fervid orator, to quote a piece of sober theological statement which just preceded that flame of sacred passion. The reference is to the *Homilies on S. Matthew*, and we shall find the theological teacher making a careful statement concerning the inward part, the Heavenly Reality, of the sacrament, and declaring it to be a thing

[1] The references for these three passages are *P. G.* 62, 612; 49, 380; and 50, 459.

incorporeal, which coming from heaven makes bread to be our Lord's body. Here are the words:

"His word cannot deceive, but our senses are easily beguiled. That hath never failed, but this in most things goeth wrong. Since, then, the word saith, 'This is My body,' let us both be persuaded, and believe, and look at it with the eyes of the mind.[1]

For Christ has given nothing sensible, but though in things sensible, yet all to be perceived by the mind. So also in Baptism, the gift is bestowed by a sensible thing, that is, the water; but that which is done is perceived in the mind, the birth, I mean, and the regeneration. For if thou hadst been incorporeal, He would have delivered thee the incorporeal gifts bare; but because the soul is locked up in a body, He delivers thee the things which the mind perceives, in things sensible." [2]

The grace of the two greater sacraments, I understand Chrysostom to mean, is a grace of union with the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ and participation in His Life. The gift is in each sacrament "incorporeal," but it must be given by means of a material element, and it may be added that because we are partly material creatures, our Saviour had to take a material embodiment, which He will retain forever, and through His embodiment in sacramental forms here, whether of water or of bread and wine, He does unite us to His glorified body in heaven, as well as to His mystical body, of so deep a humiliation, His Church on earth. But to Chrysostom the gift given in the Eucharist is a thing understandable by the mind, and not a thing perceivable by the senses. And furthermore, it is a thing "incorporeal." Now our Lord's glorified body is a thing capable of being perceived by the senses, or it has ceased to be a human body. It is

[1] I allow myself to think that this phrase, "look at it with the eyes of the mind," is quite equivalent to "take it non-literally."

[2] *Hom.* lxxxii. 4; Pusey, 570; *P. G.* 58, 743.

not perceived, according to the Oxford theology, and the Roman, because our Lord chooses that it shall not be; but it remains that it is in its nature "*capable* of being perceived" (*αἰσθητόν*). And certainly, being a body, it is *not* "incorporeal." We must take our saint non-literally, on one side of his mind, or the other, — either as rhapsodizing orator or as philosophic theologian. If we must somewhere use with S. Chrysostom this method of non-literal interpretation, with its attendant risks of so explaining one's author as to explain him away, it seems to me far more reasonable to apply it to the soaring emotional orator than to the teacher carefully explaining, and aiming to guard against mistake.

II

Macarius Magnes (A.D. 400)

Contemporary, as his writings prove, with S. Chrysostom was another bishop who has been brought to our notice in recent years, through a re-discovery of portions of his writings, under the name of Macarius Magnes.[1] He is probably to be identified with Macarius, Bishop of Magnesia, who took part (A.D. 403) in the Council of the Oak, which pronounced a sentence of condemnation and deposition upon S. Chrysostom. Indeed his having been known as an opponent of S. Chrysostom is very probably a cause of the dropping out of sight of his writings. But

[1] My references are made to his book called *Apocritica*, iii. 23. The book is cast in the form of a dialogue in which are arrayed all the strongest objections against Christianity made by heathen philosophers near the end of the fourth century. Paraphrases and a partial quotation may be found in *Stone*, p. 65 and pp. 73–74, and a paraphrase without direct quotation in the Article *Macarius Magnes*, in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. No edition of the Greek text of Macarius is easily obtainable, and I can give no references, but see Note I, p. 269.

it must be remembered that there were as yet no serious differences among the Church's theologians as to the doctrine of the Eucharist. To be sure, this was a time of controversy, and theologians were more ready than they had been in earlier days to condemn one another's phrases instead of looking for a good meaning in them. Thus Macarius disowns somewhat sharply the use of the word "type," which we have found to be nearly universal. He says that "it is not a figure (*τύπος*) of the body and a figure of the blood, as some, whose minds are blinded, have declaimed,[1] but really the body and blood of Christ."

But it should be observed that it was not at all the doctrine of Macarius that the body and blood of our Lord were present in the Eucharist as *added to* the bread and wine. Far from it! The elements themselves were made to *be* the body and blood of our Lord. Macarius speaks of "the body which is the bread" and "the blood which is the wine." That is very different indeed from calling bread "our Lord's body," and then explaining that this is said because our Lord's body is there under a veil, and is (of all that is there) the utterly predominant fact. Granting that on such terms bread might be called "our Lord's body," such a doctrine gives no excuse for speaking of "the body which is the bread." Furthermore, when Macarius wishes to make mention of the earthly part and the heavenly part together, he does not

[1] The word used is *ἐρραψῳδησαν*, which Dr. Stone translates "have foolishly said." In its original meaning *ῥαψῳδεῖν* was "to recite verses strung together at length." As a term of contempt it carried the idea of a dull repetition of other men's sayings. It may be conjectured that Macarius was a bitter Anti-Origenist, who had seen such language quoted from Origen, and was so ill-informed as to think that it marked a man as a follower of Origen. What the earlier writers had really meant by *τύπος* and *figura* seems to have been exactly the doctrine of Macarius himself.

speak of the bread as containing our Lord's body, but of "the bread . . . , being united to the power of the Holy Ghost."

The connection of these phrases will repay examination. For, in fact, here is another attempt at a philosophy of the Eucharist, such as we had from Gregory of Nyssa, and following much the same order of thought. The heathen opponent in the *Apocritica* complains that the suggestion of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of our Master is barbarous and revolting, and even if it be explained as allegorical (the heathen objector seems to have rather expected such a defense), it is still disgusting, he thinks, and repulsive to a decent mind. The Christian disputant makes answer that it is not shocking at all when rightly viewed. An infant will die unless it eats the flesh and drinks the blood of its mother, for its food is obtained from the physical substance of its mother, transmuted by the processes of nature into milk. It is not unreasonable that Christ should command those to whom He has given the privilege of becoming children of God (S. John i. 12) to eat the mystic flesh and drink the mystic blood of her who bare them. For the Wisdom of God brought forth children, and fed them from the two breasts of the two Covenants, and gave them her own flesh and blood, and bestowed upon them immortality; and this Wisdom of God, who thus did for men a mother's part, is no other than our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Then our author goes on to show that men are made from the earth, and in eating corn and wine and oil, which are fruits of the earth, they may be said to eat the flesh and blood of the earth. From the earth they are nourished, and the earth suffers no loss in giving them nourishment. Again, he points out that the Son of God created the earth with all its powers of nourishment, and

in the Incarnation took from the earth a body for Himself. Then comes the passage from which I have already quoted.

You can see that Macarius is willing to put a highly allegorical meaning on the words "body" and "blood" in connection with the eucharistic mystery. But it should be observed on the one hand, that this allegorizer uses only allegories in which some great thing is done, and done in a mysterious way, and on the other hand, that whatever meaning he does attach to those words "body" and "blood" is predicated of the bread and wine of the Eucharist quite directly. This bread and wine are not figures of that body and blood of Christ with which He has promised to feed His people. Other men have called the bread and wine "figures," as being types of our Lord's natural flesh and blood. Macarius cares nothing for any such suggestion. He regards it as idle declamation. The bread and wine *are* the great thing of the Lord's promise.

III

S. Isidore of Pelusium, Theologian and Ascetic

I will cite here a solitary phrase of one who was a great power in his day in Egypt, S. Isidore, a monk from before A.D. 395 to A.D. 449 or 450, and for years Abbot of his monastery, near the city of Pelusium. He was eminent for learning, for theological acumen, for careful discrimination and sober judgment, and so faithful in duty that he could more than once rebuke his Patriarch, being such a one as Cyril of Alexandria, and yet retain his correspondent's affectionate respect. This great man, in a letter to one Marathonius, against the heresy which denied the Personality of the Holy Spirit, speaks of our Lord as giving, to be a completion of the work of the Holy Trinity,

"the All-Holy Spirit, who is also in the Invocation of Holy Baptism numbered, as freeing from sins, with the Father and the Son, and who on the mystical table exhibits the common bread as a special body of His [our Saviour's] Incarnation." [1]

Dr. Pusey translates σῶμα ἰδικὸν, "the very body" (of His Incarnation). Rev. C. H. Hebert, in whose *Catena* I first saw the Greek of the passage, calls it "the peculiar body." It remains that there is no article, and I venture to assert that "a special body" or "a peculiar body" is the only possible meaning of that Greek phrase in that connection. It seems to point to the eucharistic body, as being somehow a different body from the natural body, of our Lord.

IV

An Unknown Writer, Caesarius

I place next to S. Isidore an obscure witness, of whom we know only his name, Caesarius, and that his date must fall in this time with which we are dealing. He wrote certain *Dialogues*, and Photius, a Patriarch of Constantinople in the eighth century, mentions a tradition that he was a brother of S. Gregory of Nazianzus. S. Gregory had certainly a brother of that name, who was a court physician, but writing a funeral panegyric on his brother, S. Gregory mentions no such book, nor does S. Jerome. The *Dialogues* of Caesarius cannot, therefore, fairly be quoted as a pendant to the study of the theology of the two Gregories, but the book has a certain value as illustrating the lines of Christian thought about the beginning of the fifth century. From his *Third Dialogue* we may read two passages, from Questions 140

[1] *Epist.* cix; Pusey, 665; *P. G.* 78, 756.

and 161, respectively. They are quoted by Dr. Pusey (p. 439), and may be found with the works of S. Gregory of Nazianzus in the *Patrologia Graeca*.[1]

"But upon the Servant of God, the Word of God, he even tramples who without fear receives His mystic mixtures with hands that are covetous and that are lifted up against his neighbor, setting on an equality with common bread and wine things which among the faithful by understanding eyes are beheld as God. For in neither (body nor blood) was He vanquished, when the one was nailed fast, and the other flowed down, nor is He again consumed when He is partaken of like the air by all, and still remains the same undiminished God."

The second of these sentences, beginning "For in neither was He vanquished," is omitted by Dr. Pusey as of no particular account. I venture to suggest that it is one of the most interesting and striking passages that we have seen. Not only are certain *visible objects* declared to be *beheld as God*, but they are so entirely assumed to be the body and blood of our Lord, that the writer goes on to speak of the one as being nailed to the Cross, and of the other as flowing down, when our Lord died. The same objects are at once visible, material objects, and yet the very body and blood of our Lord. I pass on to the other passage, where an objector is trying to charge Catholic theology with an inconsistency in disowning anthropomorphic conceptions of Deity, and yet proclaiming an Incarnate God.

"*Objector.* How is it that after disowning in your former arguments those who ascribe bodily members to Deity and speak of God as a being in the form of man, you come back now and answer that in our time He is by nature just that. *Answer.* I did not say that He was so by nature, but that He became so,

[1] *P. G.* 38, 1065, 1132.

having been united both in soul and body with our people, since also the Holy Word Himself, when He had come to be as one of us, and was sharing our manner of life, being what He was, and being seen as what He was not, said to the guild [1] of the Apostles, while distributing bread, 'Take, eat of it, all of you; this is My body,' when as yet He had not been made a sacrifice in the flesh, and 'Take, drink,' when He had not had His side pierced with a spear on the Cross. And we see that holy bread to-day laid on the stainless table in the bloodless sanctuary, at the season of the divine and mystic rite, and not looking like the image of the saving body of Him who is our God and Word, and the cup of wine that is placed with it not looking like the blood that was mingled with the same. They do not look like the articulation of His limbs, nor the quality of flesh and blood, nor yet like the invisible and secretly united Deity which has no outward form. For the one [our Lord's body] has blood, has life, has muscles, is red, is jointed, is supplied with various arteries and veins, with which also the Word that created all things has been interwoven, even to having hair and nails. For I say that the very hair of Christ is the hair of God, and His feet and nails and blood and moisture. For the Word is joined for my sake with all that is mine. So, then, the one stands erect, articulate, can walk, can act, but the other [the holy bread] is round, is inarticulate, is lifeless, bloodless, moveless, looking like neither, not like that which is seen of Him who is in His Deity invisible. But nevertheless we believe the divine revelation, and that that which is consecrated on the divine table, and everywhere distributed to the guild without division, and partaken of without failure of supply, is, not as a matter of being equal or like, but properly and fitly [as regards the use of terms] the very body of God." [2]

[1] The word used is *θιάσῳ* from *θίασος*, a word used generally of a company of persons bound together under some religious sanction.

[2] I subjoin the Greek of the last sentence: *πιστεύομεν δὲ ὅμως τῇ θεηγορίᾳ, καὶ οὐχ ὡς ὅμοιον ἢ ἴσον, ἀλλὰ κυρίως καὶ ἀραρότως αὐτὸ ὑπάρχειν τὸ θεῖον σῶμα τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς θείας τραπέζης ἱερουργούμενον, καὶ τῷ θιάσῳ πάντη ἀτμήτως διαιρούμενον, καὶ ἀλήκτως μετεχόμενον.* Dr.

According to Caesarius, then, if I understand him rightly, the material element of bread is made in consecration to be "the very body of God," though it is not, even then, like *nor equal* to the body which our Lord had before. I take "not equal" to mean here "not identical." In what other sense could it have been said that the body on the altar was not equal to the body which our Lord wore on earth, or even to the body which He wears in Heaven? If any such sense can be alleged, — I suppose that it can be done, certainly, — I must ask what reason was there for introducing that phrase here? I can think of no other meaning that seems pertinent to the argument which Caesarius is making.

V

Theodore of Mopsuestia, Eminent Commentator on Holy Scripture (A.D. 350–428)

We must pass with but a slender reference one of the greatest writers of his day, Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia, not far from Tarsus, for thirty-six years from A.D. 392. He was a really remarkable commentator on the Bible, a prince among zealous students of the literal meaning and historical background of the different books. In later years he fell under suspicion, along with his beloved teacher Diodore, Archbishop of Tarsus, as having sowed (so some declared) the seeds of the

Pusey's translation omits *αὐτὸ*, and seems to me to miss the force of *ὑπάρχειν*, and hence to reverse the author's intended relation of subject and predicate. He would render, "the divine body is that which is consecrated," meaning, apparently, "the heavenly body is the fact which is found on the altar." Caesarius means just the opposite, — "the fact which is found upon the altar, *i. e.*, bread, is the very (*αὐτὸ*) body of God," though not like, nor equal to, the natural body.

Nestorian heresy. There is no reason for imagining that his doctrine about the Eucharist ever wandered from the line of the Church's generally received thought. He has left so little of reference to this subject that his name does not appear in Dr. Pusey's great Catena nor in Dr. Stone's *History*. Yet I find two phrases of his which seem to me worthy of mention. Commenting on 1 Cor. x. 3–5, he says:

"He calls both the food and the drink spiritual, on the ground that the Spirit did Himself supply them both through Moses, according to His secret power. . . . And the expression 'That rock was Christ' was meant to say that the rock was among them what Christ is to us, whose blood we, the faithful, do spiritually drink, as it is transmade in the mysteries." [1]

Again, in commenting on S. Matt. xxvi. 26, Theodore has this to say:

"He said not, 'This is the symbol of My body, and this of My blood,' but 'This is My body, and My blood,' teaching us not to look to the nature of the elements,[2] but that through the Thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστίας*) that has been made they are changed into flesh and blood. As the woman was made a member of Adam by being taken from His bones and flesh, so we also are members of the Master's body, as having been made 'of His flesh and of His bones.'" [3]

It seems noteworthy that Theodore should show himself impatient of the word "symbol" (*σύμβολον*), as Macarius Magnes has been seen to have been impatient of the word "type," in his insistence that our Lord's

[1] *Pat. Graeca*, 66, 885.

[2] "Of the elements" — *τῶν προκειμένων*, "the things laid before God," a technical term used exactly as we use "the elements" in our modern speech.

[3] *P. G.* 66, 713.

body and blood are really given in the Eucharist. I venture to think that these writers would have acknowledged, if pressed, that, of course, the consecrated elements were "symbols" *in a sense.* It remains that Theodore is not on record as so saying, and he *is* on record as disowning that mode of speech. On the other hand, he is found, in his *Commentary on S. John*,[1] speaking of our Lord's teachings about this sacrament as "things of thought" (νοητά), as distinguished — at least that is the distinction which his old friend and fellow-student, John Chrysostom, makes — from "things of sense" (αἰσθητά). He regards the food of God as "spiritual," also, a word which in other writers we have found associated with the idea of "non-literal," though not in the very least with the idea of unreal. But chiefly I press the point that Theodore describes the elements as "changed," and as "changed into flesh and blood." My friends of the Oxford School will point out justly that they believe that a great change comes to the eucharistic elements, and that it is a change made by a great indwelling. If I may claim that the elements are magnificently "changed" by receiving a certain Presence, a certain great new ownership and use, without being in the least changed in their own nature, in their οὐσία, as a Greek writer might call it, in their "*substantia*" in Latin terminology, their "substance" in English speech, why may not the followers of the Oxford School claim that Theodore's word "changed" fits just as well with *their* view, that the elements are changed by receiving our Lord's Presence in His glorified body, "present after the manner of spirit"? I answer that so far as the mere word "changed" is concerned, they have as much right to use it as I. But Theodore says that the elements

[1] vi. 29; *P. G.* 66, 745.

are changed "into flesh and blood." He does not say that they are changed so as to be *vehicles* of our Lord's flesh and blood. That explanation, I contend, would have been perfectly easy to put into words. If that was the explanation held by the Fathers, I know of no one of them that ever did put it into words. Some of them — this great Theodore is one — say distinctly that the bread and wine are changed into flesh and blood. Whatever they may have understood by "body," or "flesh," and "blood," the result of the sacramental change, as it appeared to *their* eyes, was simply that the elements had come to *be* — not "contain" or "hide," but "be" — what those greater names portended.

VI

Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople from A.D. 428 to A.D. 431

We come now to the time when all the Eastern Church was shaken by the bitter controversy that arose between a Patriarch of Alexandria and a Patriarch of Constantinople, between Cyril and Nestorius. Both were hard men in personal temper. Those who are moved to pity for Nestorius, condemned as a heretic at the General Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, and sent into exile by the Emperor of the East, do not commonly remember — perhaps many of them never knew — that this same Nestorius was himself a bitter persecutor of persons whom he regarded as aliens in religion, and that on the occasion of his first sermon as Patriarch he addressed the Emperor with such words as these: "Give me, my prince, the earth purged of heretics, and I will give you heaven as a reward. Help me in destroying heretics, and I will help you in destroying your Persian foes." Nestorius

was not a lovable person, nor large-minded. Modern scholars have raised a question whether he really held and taught the heresy which bears his name, making out the eternal Son of God to have adopted a man as His agent, so that God did not suffer on the cross, and Jesus was not God. Certainly he laid himself widely open to suspicion of that kind. But I think that in his case, also, there is no reason to suppose that in anything he departed from the Church's ordinary teaching as to the eucharistic body. The writings of Nestorius were ordered to be destroyed after his condemnation. We have but little of his remaining, save in quotations made by his opponents. But an ancient Syriac book, preserved among Syriac-speaking Nestorians, and called *The Bazaar of Heraclides*, is now known to be the work of the deposed Patriarch of Constantinople. In this book Nestorius raises the following questions:

"Is the bread the body of Christ by a change of *οὐσία*? Or are we His body by a change? Or is the body of the Son of God one in nature with God the Word?"

To these questions Nestorius expects the answer, "No." His thought seems to run along these lines: We are all agreed on certain points, as that we who by our baptism and our communions are members of Christ, are not made to be any other than human beings, not being deified by the coming of the Divine Word to dwell in us, and that the bread which we all hold to be our Lord's body is really bread as it was before, in spite of having received the indwelling of the Divine Word. Then it follows, he would say, that the indwelling of the Divine Word in the flesh that was born of the Virgin leaves that flesh merely the flesh of a man after all.

Of course, the weak point in the argument of Nestorius

was that he inserted "of *a* man" in place of "human." Our Lord took a human nature to Himself, but not the nature of *a* man. He took a human body, but not the body of *a* man. Ordinarily a human nature implies a human person. Our Lord did not take to Himself *a* man, a human nature with a personality of its own already inherent in it. "The Word was made flesh," taking to Himself flesh as an embodiment of His own sole, Divine Person. But the things to which Nestorius appealed in his first two questions above quoted are things which the Church of his day did, I think, agree in holding. At any rate, I have seen no passage quoted from Cyril in which he objects to either of these suggestions of Nestorius.

Nestorius goes on thus:

"How is it that when He said over the bread, 'This is My body,' He did not say that the bread was not bread, and the body not body? But He said 'bread' and 'body', as showing what it is in οὐσία. But we are aware that the bread is bread in nature and in οὐσία. Yet Cyril wishes to persuade us to believe that the bread is His body by faith, and not by nature,—that what it is not as to οὐσία, that it becomes by faith."

It seems quite clear what Nestorius believed. What he was ascribing to Cyril is not so easy to make out. It is to be remembered that we are reading the language of a bitter controversialist, who is not to be supposed to be careful to be just, or even to have patience and good temper enough to make him capable of being just. What Nestorius habitually charged against Cyril was that Cyril *deified* the *flesh* of the Christ. It should be noted that in the above extract Nestorius asks tauntingly why our Lord did not say that the bread was not bread, and *the body* not *body*. The two cases stand on the same footing in the mind of Nestorius. He charges Cyril with the same offense in connection with the body natural

and the body sacramental, — the offense of *deifying* it. Nestorius insisted that the Divine Word was in His Divine Nature life-giving but that His flesh was not so. A human body, Nestorius would argue, cannot give Divine Life. It is a pitiful sort of argument. It begs the question, assuming that our Lord's human nature is the human nature of a mere man. But the poverty of the argument, and even the fact that a grave heresy lurks behind it, should not blind us to two important points in connection with our present study:

(1) Nestorius was casting about for an argument which should be popular, he was trying to offer a suggestion which everybody would accept, when he asked his triumphant question, "Is the bread the body of Christ by a change of *οὐσία*?" He seems to have expected confidently that the whole Church would say, "No."

(2) The opponents of Nestorius do not seem to have made any difficulty about that particular point. They assailed him for denying that the flesh of our Lord was life-giving. They showed that that flesh *was* life-giving in our Lord's earthly life. They anathematized Nestorius for denying that our Lord's flesh was life-giving in the Eucharist. They did not seize upon that suggestion (so striking to a modern student) that the bread which was consecrated to be our Lord's body was still, in its nature and substance, bread, remaining so still after it had become our Lord's body. They do not seem to have found any heresy in *that*, even when they were hunting down heresies, like hounds in full cry. All this is the more noteworthy, because Nestorius comes from the same theological atmosphere which formed the minds of John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia. The three together may be taken as reflecting fairly the eucharistic theology of the School of Antioch.

VII

S. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria (a.d. 376–444)

We turn to the chief opponent of Nestorius, the great Alexandrian patriarch, Cyril. He was like Nestorius in a certain hardness of mind and temper. He was not a man to make allowances, not a man to balance carefully the elements of truth that might be found in a statement which seemed to him to carry a suggestion of fundamental error. In his own theological studies he labored for balance most carefully, and maintained it most admirably. In opposing Nestorius he did not fall into the snare of Eutyches. But in his controversial writing he sometimes seems almost to be trying to make the medicines of truth difficult for his opponent to swallow. I make my personal acknowledgment that for years I had allowed my own detailed studies of patristic teaching about the Eucharist to end with Chrysostom. When, then, I came to examine with care the utterances of S. Cyril of Alexandria on this subject, my first feeling was that here I was coming into a new theological atmosphere, and perhaps even into a new theology. True, there was a passage — I shall quote it presently — in which Cyril seemed to attempt something in the way of a philosophy of the eucharistic Presence, and it seemed to me to be quite after my own heart. But other passages — and there were many of them — were filled with such a passionate assertion of the eucharistic gift as the very flesh of God, and what meant much more to me, such a habit of moving directly and altogether naturally from the flesh of our Lord's natural body to the flesh received in the Holy Eucharist, that it seemed as if my distinction between "things identified" and "things identical," even if it

were reasonably applied as a key to unlock former difficulties, could here no longer bear the strain which must be put upon it.

Having made this acknowledgment in all simplicity of honesty, I ask the indulgence of a thoughtful hearing for my statement of the conclusions as to S. Cyril's meaning to which my further study of the Nestorian controversy led me. For, in the first place, S. Cyril himself claims eagerly that he has no new theology at all. "We everywhere follow the opinions of the holy fathers," he writes to John of Antioch, "and especially those of our all-well-famed father, Athanasius, and refuse to deviate at all in anything from them." Then if it be suggested that Cyril had moved away from his predecessors unconsciously, I will add, as my second point, that (as I have said above) Cyril does not charge Nestorius with being at fault in claiming that what both parties agreed in calling "our Lord's body" was really bread. So much by way of negative argument. But there is a third point which will carry us much farther. Cyril does charge Nestorius with teaching "cannibalism." A better rendering of Cyril's word is "anthropophagy." He charges Nestorius with teaching that in the Eucharist Christians ate human flesh. To explain such a charge I must go back, and state the position of Nestorius once more. Certainly his presentation of the theology of the Incarnation was a most unhappy one. But we ought to bear in mind that he was impelled to it by motives to which we owe a genuine sympathy, — by his experience, in fact, of some unhealthy exaggerations and wild distortions of the truth, which he was beginning to hear around him, and which forced themselves upon the Church's attention within twenty years more, calling down the Church's solemn condemnation upon what we call "the Eutychian

heresy." Nestorius met with men who were proclaiming that our Lord's humanity was deified, that it was lost and swallowed up in Deity. Against such teaching the Church was called to fight a great battle. Nestorius was honestly trying to fight that fight, demanded so imperatively by a true loyalty to our Lord. He lost the balance of revealed truth, and so lost his place of leadership, and the Church had even to fight against *his* exaggerations, too. But we cannot understand his exaggerations without taking account of those of the other side. In his eagerness to maintain the entire humanness of our Lord's humanity, Nestorius interpreted the phrase, "The flesh profiteth nothing," of our Lord's own flesh. I allow myself to suppose that our Lord Himself intended to be understood as saying that even His flesh could not profit any one as by a sort of magic power, apart from a spiritual action in the receiver and a spiritual union with Himself. But Nestorius seems to have gone farther, and to have made out that our Lord's human nature was not life-giving at all, even as ministered by the Spirit of God, and received by the responsive spirit of man. At any rate, so Cyril understood him, and Cyril raged against him accordingly. Nestorius plainly held that Christians did not receive our Lord's natural flesh in the Eucharist. The bread was changed so as to become a body for our Lord, but it was *not* changed from the *οὐσία* of bread to the *οὐσία* of flesh. Cyril does not blame him for *that* teaching. But Nestorius insists that our Lord's embodiment, whether in the natural, or in the sacramental, order, is so entirely human that it has no power to give life. Cyril condemns that idea as utterly shocking, but be it observed, even Cyril, with all his tendency to look for any stick to beat a dog with, could not possibly have charged Nestorius with teaching

"anthropophagy," unless he had accepted one teaching of Nestorius, that teaching which declares that the bread which our Lord calls His body is "bread," and not (in its substance) "flesh," as being really the teaching of the Church. That the bread which is our Lord's body is of the nature of bread, and not of the nature of flesh, and yet may perfectly justly be called, and ought to be called, "the body of Jesus Christ," is the teaching of Nestorius and Cyril alike. It is common ground. When Cyril denounces Nestorius for his doctrine concerning the Eucharist, it is not for saying that the sacramental flesh of Christ is bread, — that would give no ground for the "anthropophagy" charge, — but for saying that the flesh of Christ (to whatever object that name may be applied by our Lord's authority) is not life-giving, and is only the flesh of *a man*.

As giving something in the way of a philosophy of the Eucharist, Cyril's comments on S. Matt. xxvi. 26 and S. Luke xxii. 19 may well be studied. The passage from the *Commentary on S. Matthew* is brief, the gist of it being found in the following paragraph:

"With conclusive utterance He said, 'This is My body,' and 'This is My blood,' that you may not understand the things which do appear to be a type, but that by some secret action of the Omnipotent God the things referred to[1] are truly changed into Christ's body and blood, and we partaking of them receive the life-giving and sanctifying power of the Christ. For it must needs be that by the agency of the Holy Spirit He should be mingled in us after a divine order, as by our bodies, by means of His holy flesh and precious blood, which we have had for a life-

[1] S. Cyril's phrase is τὰ παρενηνεγμένα, which seems to mean "the things put forward," "the things adduced." "The things which have been offered" would certainly be προσενηνεγμένα. He uses τὰ προειρημένα in a similar way, a little above.

giving blessing, as in bread and wine, that we should not shudder at seeing flesh and blood laid out on holy tables in churches. For God, condescending to our infirmities, sends a power of life into the elements and translates them into an efficacy which proceeds from His own life.[1] And doubt not that this is true, when He says clearly, 'This is My body' and 'This is My blood,' but rather receive with faith the word of the Saviour, for being Truth, He does not lie." [2]

The corresponding passage from the *Commentary on S. Luke* is very long, and I cannot give space to it here. It may be said that neither the passage just given, nor the companion passage from the *Commentary on S. Luke*, gives anything which bears upon my present enquiry in a positive way.[3] I quite acknowledge the point. But I do claim that these passages are of real value negatively. The great Alexandrian is undertaking to explain our Lord's words of definition of His sacrament, so far as they *can* be explained, and he does not say one word about the heavenly body being present on the earthly

[1] The Greek here is *συγκαθιστάμενος γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ταῖς ἡμετέραις ἀσθενείαις, ἐνίησι τοῖς προκειμένοις δύναμιν ζωῆς, καὶ μεθίστησιν αὐτὰ πρὸς ἐνέργειαν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς*: It is to be observed that *δύναμιν* and *ἐνέργειαν* are both without the article. So are *σῶμα* and *αἷμα* in the phrase which I have translated "Christ's body and blood" above. The thought is that the elements are changed into something which has the character of body, and something which has the character of blood, belonging to Christ, in fact, into *a* body and blood of Christ.

[2] *P. G.* 72, 452, 453.

[3] When, for example, Cyril speaks of a power of life being sent into the elements, there is nothing to show whether that power of life is a gift of our Lord's human life, reaching out, as it were, from His heavenly body, and taking to itself a new embodiment, or a gift of the heavenly body itself. The most that can be said is that the careful omission of the articles in sundry Greek phrases, where English translators as carefully put them in, may seem to lend some measure of support to my suggested interpretation.

altar. He does not deal with the difficulty — perfectly easy to deal with, some of my brethren will tell me, but certainly requiring to be dealt with — as to how our Lord's body can be in heaven and on a thousand altars at the same moment of time. But this teacher does point to the bread and wine of the Eucharist as being worthy to be called the body and blood of our Lord, and he recognizes that there *is* a difficulty involved in such a naming. For that difficulty he has an answer ready. It is not that the elements are called our Lord's body and blood, though they are not really so, because the body and blood of our Lord are really there. S. Cyril's answer seems to be rather, "These elements are really that which we are taught to call them, because God sends into them a power of life."

With so much of comment I turn to Cyril the controversialist, presenting first the passage (from the fourth of his five books *Against Nestorius*) in which he charges Nestorius with teaching anthropophagy. He first quotes Nestorius as commenting on our Lord's words (S. John vi. 53), "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you," and as saying that those who heard Him "endured not the loftiness of the revelation. They thought in their ignorance that He was introducing anthropophagy." Cyril catches at that word, and pounces upon his opponent on this wise:

"Then how is the proposition not plain anthropophagy? And in what fashion can the mystery be made out to be lofty any longer, except we declare the Word that proceedeth from God the Father to have been sent,[1] and acknowledge the particular manner

[1] Nestorius interpreted "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you" (S. John xx. 21) as referring to the Man Jesus, and not to the Divine Word.

of the sending to be that of the Incarnation? For then, and only then [Greek, τότε γὰρ τότε] shall we see the flesh that was united to Him availing to quicken us to life, and [that flesh] not as the flesh of some other person, but only because it has been made His own, who avails to quicken all things. For if fire, the very fire we know by our senses, communicates the power of the natural force which belongs to it to the materials with which it would seem to be associated, and changes even water also, which is cold by nature, into that which is contrary to its nature, and makes it warm, what wonder is it, and should it be held a thing incredible, if the Word that is from God the Father, being Life by nature, showed forth the flesh united to Him as a quickening power? For it is His own flesh, and not the flesh of some other person, who is regarded as apart from Him, and is just one of us. But if you abandon the mystical and true union of God the Word with the body that is quickening, and utterly disjoin the body from the Word, how can you prove it to be quickening? For who was He who said, 'He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him'? If it be some one of man's sort, and if it be not rather that the Word of God has been made like us, the thing that is done *is* man-eating, and our participation is absolutely without profit. For I hear Christ Himself saying, 'The flesh profiteth nothing; it is the Spirit that quickeneth.' For as regards its own nature, the flesh is mortal, and in no wise will it give life to others, having the disease of mortality in itself. But if you say that it is the own body of the Word Himself, why these portentous and vain fables? Why contend that not the Word of the Father was sent Himself, but some other instead of Him, that is, a visible being, or His flesh? Whereas the divinely inspired Scripture everywhere proclaims one Christ, strongly asserting that the Word became Man with us, and defining herein the tradition of the true faith." [1]

Nestorius and Cyril agreed in these two points, — first, that human flesh, even the flesh of our Lord, could

[1] *Adv. Nestorium* IV. 5, *Patrol. Graeca* lxxvi. 189, 192; Pusey, 655.

not be life-giving *in itself*,[1] and second, that those who came to be associated with our Lord's flesh did receive life from that association. Their difference lay in this, that Nestorius said that our Lord's Divinity gave life through a partnership with a human body, which body was not really His own after all, but only the body of His human partner, and Cyril, on the other hand, insisted that the Eternal Son of God took a human nature, and made it absolutely His own, so that His human body was as truly and entirely His body, His own body, and no other person's body, as your body is your body, and mine is mine. So Cyril is constantly pressing upon men that the body of our Lord is an "own body" (σῶμα ἴδιον) of the Divine Word. But even while Cyril is looking eagerly for something with which he may reproach Nestorius, and for something, *anything*, whereby he may make Nestorius to be abhorred, he never finds any fault with Nestorius for saying that what we receive in the Eucharist is bread and wine. He never thinks of charging Nestorius with believing in a "real absence." The only point of difference between them as to the Eucharist is that Nestorius thought participation in the Eucharist made Christians to be partners with *a man*, who in his turn was a partner with God, and Cyril stormed at this strange idea, and said that it was truly a bringing in of man-eating. It follows that when Cyril lays such stress, as he often does, on our receiving in the Eucharist "the own body of the Word," he is not contrasting our Lord's

[1] So Cyril speaks in his book, *De Recta Fide ad Theodosium*, 38:* "Shall I not confess that the flesh from the earth had in its own nature no power to give life? How, then, tell me, is the flesh life-giving? Or how can that of earth be understood to be of heaven, too? I say, By union, the union with the Living Word from heaven."

* *P. G.* 76, 1192.

body with bread, as all modern readers are inclined at once to assume, but rather contrasting our Lord's own body with the body of some other person, a man, Jesus, supposed to be taken into partnership with the Word. I shall proceed to give some brief illustrations of this habit of Cyril's mind from other controversial writings of his. Much more may be found in the fifty pages which Dr. Pusey devotes to S. Cyril of Alexandria in his Catena (Pusey, pp. 614–664).

From Cyril's *Twelve Anathemas against Nestorius* I take the Eleventh Anathema, and Cyril's later explanation of the Anathema.

Anathema XI

"If any one confesses not that the flesh of the Lord is life-giving, and that it is the own flesh of the Word which is from God the Father, but says that it is of some other than He, joined to Him in dignity, that is, having, as it were, an indwelling only, and [confess] not rather that it is life-giving, as we have said, because it is become an own flesh of the Word which can quicken all things, let him be anathema."

Explanation of the above Anathema

"We celebrate the holy and life-giving and bloodless sacrifice in our Churches, not believing the offering to be the body of one of us, and of a common man, likewise also the precious blood, receiving them rather as being the own body and also blood of Him who quickeneth all things. For common flesh cannot quicken, and the Saviour Himself witnessed this, saying, 'The flesh profiteth nothing, it is the Spirit that quickeneth.' For since it became the own flesh of the Word, it is so understood, and is quickening, according as the Saviour Himself saith, 'As the Living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father, he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me.' Since Nestorius and

they who agree with him do ignorantly destroy the power of the mystery, therefore, and reasonably, this is anathema." [1]

So also in the *Defense against Orestes, Prefect of Alexandria*, we find this sentence, — "We say that it [our Lord's flesh] became the own body of the Word, and not of some man, conceived of as Christ and Son, separate and distinct from Him." Cyril's emphasis on this phrase "own body," is constantly directed against the Nestorian idea of a body of some *man*. Of course, if the modern student approaches such passages with the modern pre-supposition, that "the own body of our Lord," or even "an own body of our Lord," cannot possibly mean anything but our Lord's natural body, in which He reigns in heaven, then such passages — and there are many of them — will furnish overwhelming evidence that Cyril held one of the modern views. Just so, if any student approaches the language of the Fathers with a pre-supposition that when a writer says that our bread and wine are made to become the body and blood of our Lord, that writer must intend to support the modern doctrine of Transubstantiation, such a student can find, nay, *must* find, Transubstantiation written manifoldly across the pages of early Christian Literature. But both these pre-suppositions, common as they are in different quarters, are thoroughly unreasonable. All Christian thought in the first five Christian centuries identified the element of bread in the Eucharist with our Lord's body, and the element of wine with His blood. At least, that is what I have been maintaining in these Lectures, and what I deeply believe. The consecrated bread was to one of those early believers just as much

[1] The Anathema and the Explanation of the Anathema may be found in the *Patrologia Graeca* 76, 309, 311. The above quotations are given in Pusey, pp. 661, 662.

our Lord's body as the very body of His natural flesh. If it be granted that my explanation of the language of such men as Augustine and Jerome and Chrysostom is a possible one, treating the eucharistic body of our Lord as a body distinct from His natural body, united with it, identified with it, but not identical with it, then certainly the language of Cyril will bear the same construction.

The question that we have to try to settle may be put thus: Does Cyril truly identify the hallowed bread with our Lord's body, really meaning, as I have interpreted him, that our Lord takes bread for a body and wine for blood? or does Cyril simply *call* bread our Lord's body, and wine our Lord's blood, because in each case our Lord's body and His blood are there present, and the majesty of that presence fills the mind of the believer, as if the great inner reality, there symbolized, alone were there? As tending to confirm my view of Cyril's meaning, I offer his comment of S. John xx. 16, — the story of our Lord's appearance on the eighth day: [1]

"Most reasonably, then, do we in the churches make holy assemblies on the octave. And if I may speak in a more mystical manner, the thought constraining us uncontrollably, we shut to the doors, and Christ appears to us all, both visibly and invisibly, invisibly as God, and visibly again in the body, and He permits and grants us to touch His holy flesh. For according to the grace of God we approach to the participation of the mystical Eucharist, receiving Christ in our hands, that we too may firmly believe that He hath truly raised His own Holy Temple."

The eucharistic body of our Lord, according to S. Cyril, is something that we can see and touch.

I shall give one more example of Cyril, again offering something in the way of a philosophy of the Eucharist,

[1] *P. G.* 74, 725.

and again the interest will be chiefly in noting what he does not say. It is drawn from the *Commentary on S. John*, where he is considering S. John xv. 1:[1]

"Let some one tell us the cause, and come and teach us the power, of the mystical Eucharist. For it comes to be in us — for what reason? (γίνεται γὰρ ἐν ἡμῖν διὰ τί;) Is it not as making Christ to dwell in us even corporeally (καὶ σωματικῶς) by the participation and communion of His holy flesh? Indeed I think that I speak rightly. For Paul writes that the Gentiles were made fellow-members of one body, and fellow-heirs, and fellow-partakers with Christ. How were they, then, shown to be fellow-members of a body? Because, being admitted to partake of the mystical blessing, they are become one body joined to Him, just exactly the same as each one of the holy Apostles. For why did he call his own members, yea, the members of all [Christians], as well as his own, the members of Christ? For he writes, 'Know ye not that your members are the members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them members of an harlot? God forbid!' But the Saviour Himself says, 'He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood dwelleth in Me, and I in him.' For here it is specially to be observed that Christ says, that He shall be in us, not by a certain relation only, such as is entertained through the affections, but also by a participation of His nature [κατὰ μέτεξιν φυσικήν]. For as, if one mixeth wax with other wax, and melteth them by means of the fire, there resulteth a single something, so by the participation of the body of Christ and of His precious blood, we are co-united, He in us, and we in Him. For in no other way could that which is by nature mortal be made living, unless it were mixed in bodily wise with the body of Him who is by nature Life, the Only-begotten. And if you are not persuaded by my words, give credence to Christ Himself, crying, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise

[1] *P. G.* 74, 341, 344.

him up at the last day.' You hear now Himself plainly declaring that unless we have eaten His flesh and drunk His blood, we have not in ourselves, that is, in our own flesh [ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ σαρκὶ], eternal life. But eternal life may be conceived, and very justly conceived, as the flesh of Him who is Life, that is, of the Only-begotten."

The closing thought seems to be that the life which is eternal may be regarded as an *embodiment* of the Eternal Word. No human life could have eternal quality unless it were taken up and worn by Him. Thus the passage closes on a note of non-literalness which shows this great Cyril to be in the true Alexandrian succession with his master Athanasius, and with Origen and Clement of the centuries before. And again we are admonished that with the great Christian teachers of early time the non-literal is not by any means the non-real.

LECTURE VII

LATER THEOLOGIANS WHO PRESS THE PARALLEL OF THE INCARNATION AND THE EUCHARIST

HAVING now presented, in my last five Lectures, as fair and faithful a representation as I was able to make of the whole testimony of the Church's writers in regard to the subject we are considering for the first four hundred years of the Church's life, I ask leave now to present the testimony of four writers [1] lying outside of this limit of time, because of a special interest that attaches to them. Three of them are eminent teachers, one of them being, indeed, a Bishop of Rome. The other is anonymous, which makes it probable that he was obscure. They all insist particularly on the parallel, which the mind of the Church seems to me always to have perceived, between the mystery of the Eucharist and the mystery of the Incarnation, and they present that parallel in a deeply significant way. Before introducing these last witnesses, however, I want to put before you a very representative passage (very representative, I mean, of the modern attitude of mind) from Dr. Darwell Stone's *History*, I. 98.

"In the period now under review," he says, speaking of the fourth and fifth centuries, "there is but little attempt to explain the method of the relation of the presence of the body and blood of Christ to the elements of bread and wine. The writers who say anything bearing on this subject may be divided into two

[1] One of them, S. John of Damascus, must be reserved to Appendix I.

groups, — those who push the connection between the Incarnation and the Eucharist in the direction of emphasizing the abiding reality of the elements of bread and wine, and those who tend toward affirming a change in the elements themselves."

Two things in this little paragraph are profoundly characteristic of the difference between most modern theology and all ancient theology. First there is the suggestion of some relation of some presence of our Lord's body and blood to the eucharistic elements. It is quite assumed by Dr. Stone, as by moderns generally, of course, that "our Lord's body and blood" must mean our Lord's *natural* body and blood, and therefore that if there is any presence of these powers in the Eucharist, the Lord's body and blood will constitute *one* fact, and the elements will constitute another, and lesser fact. But, as I have pointed out over and over, ancient theology never defines, nor even suggests, any presence of our Lord's heavenly body under sacramental veils. It always identifies the consecrated elements themselves with our Lord's body and blood. "Body" is its name, and its only name, for the hallowed bread. "Blood" is its name, and its only name, for the hallowed wine. In the case of either element there is one fact, not two. There is really just one *fact*, which may be regarded under either of two aspects. The element of bread, for instance, is a single fact. It may be regarded as bread, or it may be regarded as our Lord's body. You may call it either. You may not be allowed to distinguish between this bread and the Lord's body which it has come to be, as if the bread were one thing, and the body another. With the utmost respect for a student who seems to me to have in general a rare gift for representing justly the workings of other men's minds, even of minds differing much from his own, I must here take leave to criticize.

I must declare my deep conviction that no ancient Christian could have understood what a theologian was trying to say who used that so utterly modern phrase, — "the relation of the presence of the body and blood of Christ to the elements of bread and wine."

My second criticism is, that it is wholly characteristic of modern, as distinguished from ancient, theology, to find any opposition, or even any difference between "emphasizing the abiding reality of the elements" and "affirming a change in the elements." Why, those two things go together constantly in ancient theology. The modern mind is in the habit of assuming that if the elements in the Eucharist are to suffer any great and glorifying change, they must be changed into our Lord's natural body and blood, or into *vehicles* of our Lord's natural body and blood. The Roman theologian follows the former of these lines of thought. Of course, he has no patience with the idea that the bread and wine remain as bread and wine, and writers who indicate such a belief must by him be condemned or explained away. The Anglican theologian of the School of Dr. Stone takes the other line. He holds that the elements are changed into vehicles of our Lord's body and blood, and then the great realities which they contain and convey so fill the mind of the believer that in looking at the bread he sees nothing but the body of the Lord. He says confidently that our Lord Himself calls the visible things of this sacrament by the names of the invisible things. And yet the pious modern Anglican of the Oxford School does not really in his devout heart call bread and wine our Lord's body and blood. He is acutely aware, at every moment, of the difference between the sacramental elements and that which he regards them as conveying. He does not think that the elements of bread and wine

are really changed at all in their essential nature. And so when he is a man of Dr. Stone's acuteness of perception, and unflinching honesty in recognition, of facts of thought, he has to acknowledge a difference of tone between himself and the Fathers who dwell on the material elements of the Eucharist as really being changed, so as to be — really to *be* — the body and blood of our Lord. Here again, therefore, I must express my deep conviction that ancient theology could have seen no theological difference between two common ways of looking at the same thing, — the way of affirming the abiding reality of the bread and wine and the way of affirming the glorious transformation of them to be the body and blood of the Lord. I must insist that Dr. Stone's "two groups" of theologians are not really distinct enough to constitute two species of the genus "theologian." All those who press the analogy of the Incarnation assure us that the elements are made to be the body and blood of the Lord. All those who say that the elements are "changed" into something give evidence, nevertheless, that the change which they have in mind is not a change of substance, but a change of quality. He who from a poor man, without rank or following, becomes a king, is greatly changed, and in fact, trans-made; but he remains a man, even as he was before. Between those who dwell most on the identity and those who dwell most on the change there is no room for real difference of opinion.

With so much of introduction I shall present my remaining witnesses to the eucharistic tradition of the Church of Christ.

I

Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus (A.D. 393–458)

The first that I shall name is one of the most interesting and attractive figures of the fifth century, Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus in the Euphrates valley for some thirty-five years, from the year 423 to 458. By nature a man of peace, he lived to see the Church shaken awfully by the strife of two contending parties, — a sort of Broad Church party whose extreme mistakes were represented by the heresy of Nestorius, and a sort of High Church party, whose extreme mistakes were represented by the heresy of Eutyches. Himself a son of Antioch, and of the Antiochene theological school, he was in sympathy with Nestorius at the beginning of that dreadful strife, and was inclined to look with suspicion on everything that came from Alexandria, and particularly from the great and overbearing Archbishop Cyril. It would seem, too, that at times Theodoret really took the wrong side in the controversies of the day, and for a time embraced opinions that could not be entirely cleared from the charge of heresy. But when the storm cleared, the saintly Bishop of Cyrrhus was found having "peace at the last," planted with firm feet and clear vision on the orthodox side. If he made mistakes, and sometimes fought against real champions of the faith, it is to be noted that the dangers which disturbed and alarmed him were real dangers. It was because he saw the evil which flowered presently in the Eutychian delusion threatening the Church that he was so far thrown off his balance for a while as to be entangled in the Nestorian misunderstandings. But he recovered a true balance at last, and was received in the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) as an orthodox bishop. Canon Bright describes him as

"*facile princeps* among his brethren for varied learning," and adds that his warmth of heart "enables us to feel towards him as (S. Augustine excepted) we can hardly feel towards any of his contemporaries in East or West."

In the last decade of his life this great man wrote three dialogues, in which he represented an orthodox believer as arguing with a follower of Eutyches. *Orthodoxus* and *Eranistes* are the names which he gives to his speakers. An ἔρανος was a sort of club-feast or picnic, to which a number of persons contributed. *Eranistes*, then, does not mean "a beggar," as some have said, but rather "a *picnic* theologian," a person whose feast of reason has not a well-ordered bill of fare, but consists of scraps brought together from various sources, and not systematized. The title given to his *Dialogues* by Theodoret himself is *Eranistes, or Polymorphus*, and the word *Polymorphus*, "of many forms," seems to be meant to convey the idea of a man who keeps changing his shape like *Proteus* in the fable, a man incapable of consistency. *Picnic Theology, or the Chameleon Student* would represent Theodoret's idea to an English-speaking enquirer of our day. In both the first and the second of these dialogues reference is made to the Church's accepted doctrine of the Eucharist as throwing light on the doctrine of the Incarnation.

Two points are to be noted before we approach the study of these passages.

1. The two parties regard the doctrine of the Eucharist as something about which there is general agreement. It can be appealed to to settle disputed questions.

2. The two parties agree in finding a sufficient analogy between the eucharistic Presence of our Lord and His Incarnation, so that the one may be expected to throw light on the other.

When I say that both parties agreed, I mean, of course that Theodoret *thought* that they agreed. He was launching an argument which he thought to be strong in itself and appealing to the people who were ensnared by the arguments of Eutyches and his followers. Perhaps Theodoret exaggerated the amount of agreement among theologians, but certainly he knew the mind of the theologians of his day particularly well. He represents both parties as appealing to the analogy of the Incarnation, — it is to be supposed that he is combating arguments which he had really known Eutychians to make, — and he represents both parties as holding that there is a tremendous change in the elements as the result of the consecration. There appears no ground for suggesting that one party was pressing the Incarnation analogy and the other party the sacramental change. I shall present the passage from the *Second Dialogue* first.

"*Orthodoxus.* Tell me now: the mystic symbols which are offered to God by those who perform priestly rites, — of what are they symbols?

Eranistes. Of the body and blood of the Lord.

Orth. Of that which is really a body? or not? [1]

Eran. Of that which is really a body.

[1] I must here call attention to a slip in translation in Dr. Stone's "*History*," I. 99. He makes *Orthodoxus* say,

"Is it really the body? or is it not?"

But besides the fact that Theodoret's phrase, τοῦ ὄντως σώματος, ἢ οὔ; requires the translation given above, it may be observed that the argument itself requires this sense. *Eranistes* is forced to acknowledge that our Lord's body now in heaven is still a real body, and *Orthodoxus* then hammers in the point. "Yes, a type must have a real thing for its archetype."

I ought to add that Dr. Stone's translations can very rarely be faulted. So far as I am able to judge of such matters, their general fidelity is quite exceptional.

Orth. Very good: for the image must have its archetype. For indeed painters imitate nature, and depict the images of things that are seen.

Eran. True.

Orth. If then the divine mysteries are anti-types of that which is really a body, then the body of the Lord is even now a body, and it has not been changed into the Divine Nature, but filled with a divine glory.

Eran. Opportunely have you introduced the subject of the divine mysteries, for from this I shall show you the change of the Lord's body into another nature. Answer now to my questions.

Orth. I will answer.

Eran. Before the priestly invocation, what do you call the gift that is being offered?

Orth. One should not say it openly, for it is likely that some who are uninitiated are present.

Eran. Let your answer be phrased enigmatically.

Orth. The food that is made of a kind of grain.

Eran. And by what name do you call the other symbol?

Orth. This name is common too, signifying a kind of drink.

Eran. But after the consecration how do you entitle these things?

Orth. Christ's body and Christ's blood.[1]

Eran. And do you really believe that you partake of Christ's body and Christ's blood?

Orth. I do.

Eran. As then the symbols of the body and blood of the Lord are one thing before the priestly invocation, and after the invocation are changed, and become another thing, so the body of the Lord after His taking up was changed into the Divine Substance.

Orth. You are caught in the net of your own weaving. For even after the consecration the mystice symbols do not depart

[1] It should be noted that σῶμα and αἷμα are both without the article. "Something that has the quality of body, and belongs to Christ, something which has the quality of blood, and belongs to Christ."

from their own nature, for they remain in their former substance (οὐσίᾳ) and figure and form; and they are visible and tangible, as they were before. But they are regarded as being just what they have become, and they are believed so to be, and they are worshipped as being just what they are believed to be. Compare then the image with the archetype, and you will see the likeness. (For the type must be like the reality.) For that body [our Lord's heavenly body is meant, of course] preserves its former form, figure, and limitation, and, in a word, the substance of the body; but after the resurrection it became immortal and superior to corruption, it was counted worthy of the seat on the right hand, it is adored by every creature, as being called the natural body of the Lord.

Eran. Yes; but the mystic symbol changes its former title, and is no longer named with the name by which it was called before, but is entitled 'body.' So must the Reality be called God, and not body.

Orth. You seem to me to be ignorant; for it is called not only body, but also bread of life. So the Lord Himself entitled it; and that very body we call a divine body, and life-giving, and the body of our Master and Lord, teaching that it is not common to every man, but is peculiar to our Lord Jesus Christ, who is both God and Man." [1]

It should be observed that the orthodox speaker does not question in the least the statement that after the invocation the elements are changed, and become another thing. Nay, he repeats it in his own phrase, — "They are regarded as being just what they have become." They have been turned from being merely one thing to being also another thing. Yet they have *lost* nothing. They continue to be that "one thing," exactly as they were before. In stating the difference of the two speakers, Dr. Stone has this sentence:

[1] The passage may be found in *Pat. Graeca*, 83, 165–168, and in translation in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, III. 200, and (parts of it) in Pusey, 85 and 112, and Stone, I. 99.

"The Eutychian maintains that after the ascension the body of Christ is changed into the Divine Nature, so as to be no longer a human body, and after the consecration the elements are changed into the body and blood of Christ, so as to be no longer bread and wine." (Stone, I. 101.)

I venture to suggest that the last part of Dr. Stone's sentence needs modifying. That the elements were so changed as to be "no longer bread and wine" is just what the Eutychian *did not say*, but would have had to say, to make a valid argument. Theodoret's precise point is that the Eutychian has *not* a valid argument. Indeed Theodoret represents his Eutychian as having a confused mind. This poor *Eranistes* has been so carried away by the thought of the wonderful change and exaltation of the eucharistic elements that he has completely lost sight of the crucial fact, that after all they are still bread and wine. But note what follows! When *Orthodoxus* reminds him of that part of the accepted doctrine of the Church of Christ, *Eranistes* does not tell *Orthodoxus* that he is wrong. He cannot say that. He is, as *Orthodoxus* said, fairly caught in the net of his own weaving. He can only give up that particular point, and renew his attempt to make something out of the *other* side of the truth, taking it up and pressing it once more. At least, says *Eranistes*, the elements are now called by a greater name than they ever were before. Therefore our Lord's body of flesh must be called by a greater name than it could have been before.

And here I must call most particular attention to the nature of the Eutychian argument, as *Eranistes* is made to state it, and as *Orthodoxus* feels obliged to meet it. It is founded on an analogy between the two miracles, of the Incarnation and the Eucharist, which is assumed all through by both parties, without being mentioned at all.

It is part of the subconscious mind (to use a modern phrase) of both parties. What is true of the Eucharist, they think, must be true of the Incarnation, and *vice versa*. At least, there is a certain likeness in the two cases, and in the lines of that likeness the same law must operate for both. I offer my suggestion — the only one that I can find — that the likeness which was in the mind of all fifth-century Christians was this: In the miracle of the Incarnation the Eternal Word took to Himself flesh for a body, and in the miracle of the Eucharist the Eternal Word took to Himself bread for a body, and wine to be for a certain use His blood. Then (the argument runs naturally on) the effect of the touch of His Deity must be the same in the one miracle as in the other. That is the line of argument, it seems to me, that is common to *Orthodoxus* and *Eranistes* in the dialogue. There is absolutely no difference between the orthodox believer and the heretic as to their holding in this matter. They hold with equal eagerness the idea of analogy between Incarnation and Eucharist. They hold with equal eagerness that the elements which receive union with our Lord are greatly exalted and changed thereby, while yet remaining the same in substance and form. But *without* such an analogy as I have just suggested, there is no reason for arguing from the Eucharist to the Incarnation. The argument is senseless. It is no argument at all.

I proceed to the promised quotation from the *First Dialogue:*

"*Orthodoxus.* You know that our Lord has entitled bread His own body.

Eranistes. I know it.

Orth. And contrariwise, He has called His flesh wheat.[1]

[1] The reference is to S. John xii. 23, 24.

Eran. I know this too, for I have heard Him saying, 'The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified,' and 'Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.'

Orth. But in the delivery of the mysteries, certainly, He called the bread body, and the mixture blood.

Eran. He did so name them.

Orth. But then with reference to nature, it is the body that should be called body, and the blood, blood.

Eran. Confessedly.

Orth. But our Saviour, for His part, interchanged the names, and has put upon the body the name of the symbol, and upon the symbol the name of the body. In like manner, having named *Himself* Vine, He entitled the symbol blood.

Eran. You have said truly. But I should like to know the cause of this interchange of names.

Orth. The object is plain to those who have been initiated into the things of God. For He willed that those who partake of the divine mysteries should not give their attention to the things seen, but through the exchange of the names believe in the transformation that has come from the grace. For He who entitled the body which is His by nature, corn and bread, and again named Himself Vine, has also honored the visible symbols with the titles of body and blood, not changing their nature, but adding the grace to their nature." [1]

I have a comment to add to this quotation also. I ask attention to the fact that Theodoret makes his orthodox speaker present in close parallel the language of our Lord calling Himself a vine, and the language of our Lord calling wine His blood. It seems plain to me that Theodoret was a non-literalist, and that he expected

[1] The passage may be found in *Pat. Graeca*, 83, 56, and in the translation in *Ante-Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, III. 168. Also in Pusey, 87; Stone I. 101. Dr. Stone renders "dignified the visible symbols with the titles of *the* body and *the* blood" [italics mine].

any other theologian, even an opponent in a great controversy, to go along with him in that line of thought, as a matter of course. I ask attention also to the combination of a distinct statement that the elements are "transformed" (μεταβάλλειν is the Greek verb) with another distinct statement that our Lord does not change their nature, but adds to their nature "the grace."

What does Theodoret mean by "the grace"? The Oxford School will answer, "The Presence of our Lord in his totality, body, blood, soul and Divinity." But that Presence, I submit, would call for a different sort of language. That Presence would not make the bread and wine to *be* our Lord's body and blood, but to be *vehicles* of His body and blood. According to that view our Lord does not take bread to be His body, nor wine to be His blood. He has no need of any body beside His body natural. Not only does Theodoret, like the Fathers before him, insist that the bread and wine *are* somehow our Lord's body and blood, and never speak of them as containing or veiling the body which is in heaven, but a little farther on in the dialogue just quoted he has this passage:

"*Orthodoxus.* Of what do you understand the holy food to be a symbol and type? Of the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ? or of His body and blood?

Eranistes. Plainly of those things of which they have received the names.

Orth. You mean, of the body and of the blood.

Eran. I do.

Orth. You have spoken like a lover of truth; for when the Lord took the symbol, He did not say, 'This is My Divinity,' but 'This is My body,' and again, 'This is My blood'; and in another place, 'The bread which I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.'"

Certainly Theodoret held that our Lord gave Himself in His Divinity to be received by His people in the Eucharist. As certainly Theodoret insists that the bread of the Eucharist is made to be His body, and *not* His Divinity. Let us note how the bread of the Eucharist is correlated to our Lord's body and to His Divinity, respectively, in Theodoret's view. I think that the matter may be put into two corresponding statements on this wise.

1. The consecrated bread symbolizes our Lord's body, according to this teaching, and *is* our Lord's body; but there is no suggestion that it contains our Lord's body.

2. The consecrated bread does contain (in a sense) our Lord's Divinity, which yet cannot be contained; but it does not symbolize our Lord's Divinity, and is never said to *be* our Lord's Divinity.

No theology, then, I allow myself to claim, which puts the Lord's body and the Lord's Divinity into the same relation with the eucharistic elements is really the theology of Theodoret.

II

Gelasius I., Bishop of Rome

The second of my supplemental witnesses is a Bishop of Rome, Gelasius I., who occupied the great see of the West from A.D. 492 to 496. It is not good history to call any Bishop of Rome a "Pope," however much he and many other bishops may have been called by that name in their own day, before the coming of the Forged Decretals. What "pope" means to our ears did not really exist till the ninth century. But certainly Gelasius was a Roman bishop who magnified his office with really papal pretensions. His chief claim on the Church's

memory is in his book of offices, the Gelasian Sacramentary, but he has also laid the Church under obligation by his treatise, if it be his,[1] on *The Two Natures in Christ*, from which I must draw a really striking passage:

"Certainly, the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ received by us are a matter belonging to the realm of the divine, because we are indeed made partakers by them of the Divine Nature; and yet the substance or nature of bread and wine

[1] I may mention that Roman theologians are inclined to question the authorship of this treatise, and to assign it to an obscure Gelasius, who was Bishop of Cyzicus in Asia Minor. In view of the fact that the treatise is not only mentioned, but actually quoted from, as a work of Gelasius, Bishop of Rome, by S. Fulgentius of Ruspe, a contemporary writer, it seems hardly worth while to go into the arguments for rejecting the Roman authorship. But I will mention one of them. Several Greek writers are quoted in this Roman book, and only two Latin writers. Surely, it is suggested, the author must have been an Eastern himself. It is commonly replied that the book was meant for circulation in the East, to give the great authority of the representative see of the West, and by implication, of the Western Church generally, to the contentions of the orthodox party in the sorely divided East. Supporting arguments drawn from great authorities in former times would with Eastern readers be more useful, if drawn from Eastern sources. But I wish to add here a conjecture of my own, — I have not seen it anywhere put forth, — that the treatise was written for Gelasius in Greek by a Greek scholar in his employ, and sent out under the name, and with the approval, of Gelasius, a somewhat clumsy translation into Latin being retained to represent the treatise in the West. The first sentence of the passage which I am to quote is clumsy and actually ungrammatical in Latin, and to my thinking shows plainest signs of having been written originally in Greek. "Sacramenta quae sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi divini res est" — notice the plural subject and singular verb — is a very awkward translation of some such Greek phrase as *τὰ ὑφ ἡμῶν ληφθέντα μυστήρια τοῦ σώματός τε καὶ τοῦ αἵματος Χριστοῦ χρῆμά ἐστι τοῦ θείου*. The loss of the Greek original is easily accounted for by the increasing bitterness of the Eastern Churches in later centuries against Bishops of Rome. But certainly the Latin quoted above is a translation from Greek by a literary "hack."

does not cease to be. And certainly an image and likeness of the body and blood of Christ are set forth in the celebration of the mysteries. Therefore it is shown to us plainly enough that we must think in the case of the Lord Christ that which we profess and celebrate and receive in the case of His image. Thus as the natures pass into this, that is, the divine substance, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, while yet remaining in their own proper being, they show that that principal mystery itself [the mystery of the Incarnation is meant, of course], the efficacy and virtue of which they truly present [1] to us, remains one Christ, because whole and real, these natures of which He is made up remaining each in its proper being."

The Latin is crabbed, and the text needs emending, to make sense; but what the writer was trying to convey is beyond question. I used to be taught in my student days, as nearly as I can now recall, that the idea of this passage was that there were two distinct realities in the Eucharist, — the material element, bread or wine, on the one side, the heavenly fact of the body and blood of Christ, on the other side, and that correspondingly there were in the Incarnation two distinct realities, the human nature and the Divine Nature of our Lord. That was supposed to be the fundamental fact of the comparison. I do not see that Gelasius does say that thing exactly. If he had said only that, it would have been open to a Eutychian opponent to say: "Oh! yes. You are quite right in asserting that there is a likeness between the conditions of the Incarnation and the conditions of the Eucharist, according to your view, which likeness is not found in my view. I consider that that is precisely the

[1] The Latin word is *representant*, which is used for making things to be present either (1) literally, or (2) to the mind of some person or persons interested. I use the word "present" in English as having the same ambiguity, while "represent" is with us limited to meaning (2). I imagine the Greek to have had *ἀποφαίνει*, probably in sense (1).

fact of the case. The conditions of the Incarnation and the conditions of the Eucharist are not alike in that particular point. Why should they be alike?"

No, what Gelasius says is, first and foremost, that the elements of the Eucharist are brought into such a relation to our Lord Jesus Christ, that what is true of that sacrament must be true of the Incarnation, also. Gelasius is laying down, be it observed, what he regards as a universally accepted proposition, in which all Catholic Christians will of course agree. It amounts to this, if I may paraphrase him: the elements in the Eucharist are taken to Himself by our Lord, as He took a body to Himself in His Incarnation. It is clearly shown to us, therefore, that we must think of the Incarnation as we think of the Eucharist. What happens to the bread and wine in passing "into the Divine Substance" must be what happens to the body of our Lord in passing "into the Divine Substance." It is the same experience in both cases. The particular point which Gelasius is essaying to prove is that as the bread and wine remain bread and wine, so the human body of flesh remains a human body of flesh. But the foundation of the argument, the thing which Gelasius is here offering as a commonplace of Catholic theology, is that our Lord is known to take the elements of the Eucharist into precisely such a union with Himself as that union into which He took His human body in His Incarnation.

So much seems to me quite clear and certain in the teaching of Gelasius. I will add a suggestion which is, I acknowledge, quite conjectural and uncertain. Our Latin text speaks of the elements as passing "into the Divine Substance." What can Gelasius be supposed to mean? Surely, it is not at all a natural way of saying that the elements pass into the substance of our Lord's

body. It suggests rather some such phrase as writers on the Incarnation have been wont to use, like that of the Athanasian Creed, "taking of the manhood into God." I offer my suggestion for what it may be worth, that the Greek author who prepared the message of Gelasius to the troubled East, wrote here the words *εἰς τὴν θείαν ὑπόστασιν*. We know that Latin writers had a habit of translating *ὑπόστασις* by *substantia*, and that they found a great deal of difficulty in understanding the use of *ὑπόστασις* as a theological word by Greek writers. But certainly that phrase about passing "into the divine substance" is an awkward phrase, whatever interpretation may be put upon it, and its interpretation must be set down as conjectural rather than clear. I return to my main point. The treatise presses the idea that our Lord takes the elements of the Eucharist to Himself so exactly as He takes the body of His Incarnation that the Church *must* argue from the one mystery to the other. Such seems to me to be the teaching of Gelasius, Bishop of Rome.

III

An Unknown Writer of the Second Half of the Fifth Century, Author of an *Epistle to Caesarius*

I must add here a brief passage for the knowledge of which I am indebted to Dr. Stone's *History*. It comes from a letter which is printed with the works of S. John Chrysostom, because it is ascribed to him in manuscripts. No one now supposes it to be his, but there is no trace of the real author, and, in fact, the Greek original is lost. It exists only in a Latin version. From internal evidence it is assigned to the period in which Gelasius flourished,

— the second half of the fifth century. It gives another example of the application of a (confidently assumed) parallel between the Incarnation and the Eucharist.

"As before the bread is consecrated we call it bread, but after the grace of God has consecrated it through the agency of the priest it is set free from the name of bread, but counted worthy of the name of the body of the Lord, although the nature of bread remains in it, and we speak not of two bodies, but of one body of the Son, so in this case, when the Divine Nature established itself in a body, the two natures made one Son, one Person." [1]

Here is, I think, the same view of the Eucharist as in Theodoret and Gelasius. The nature of bread remains after the consecration. That is one point. But then this bread, now exalted to a higher usefulness, is "set free from the name of bread, but counted worthy of the name of the body of the Lord." That is a second point, and I think an important one. I have said over and over that I cannot see why that which is a vehicle, or a veil, for our Lord's body should be called our Lord's body, nor why a revelation that it was to be such a vehicle, or veil, could not have been made in much plainer words. Of course, I know that many devout students, who are also strong and clear thinkers, will find my argument in both these particulars to be of no value. I must not take time to argue the same point over again now. I will only say that this author's phrase seems to

[1] The Latin here is somewhat remarkable, preserving as it does a word of the original Greek which seems to have struck the translator particularly: "Sic et hic, Divina ἐνιδρυσάσης, id est, insidente corpori Natura, unum Filium, unam Personam, utraque haec fecerunt." It will be observed that "Divina insidente Natura" is an ablative absolute translating a Greek *genitive* absolute. Hence the curious combination, "ἐνιδρυσάσης, id est, insidente."

me to fit more easily with what I have been offering as an interpretation of patristic thought than with the theology which says that the hallowed bread is one entity, and the body of our Lord another entity.

I must pass to the third point, which will show our author, with the same theology of the Eucharist, making a different application of the Incarnation parallel from the two writers last studied. He is turning it against the opposite heresy from that which they were attacking, and he does not seem to me to be so strong or so clear. He uses a phrase which is certainly novel (we have had to travel over a space of four hundred and fifty years, to find anything of the sort), and certainly noteworthy, — "We speak not of two bodies, but of one body of the Son." What shall I say of this utterance? Shall I describe it as a new view? Or shall I call it only a new expression of the same teaching with which we have been made familiar? And then it will be pressed upon me, of course, that *I do* "speak of two bodies of the Son," and represent the Fathers as so speaking, and here comes one of my own witnesses, and testifies against me. I must dispose of this charge, that my witness contradicts me flatly, before I attempt to show the bearing of his phrase upon the argument against the followers of Nestorius. In my own defense my answer is this: I have certainly been maintaining in every one of my Lectures, as my own thought, and as the thought of the whole primitive Church, that the eucharistic body of our Lord is numerically distinct from His natural body, and that *in that sense* our Lord has two bodies, nay three, for there is also His body the Church; but I have also equally maintained, as my own thought, and as the thought of the whole primitive Church, that whatever our Lord takes for a body is so united with His natural body as

to become a part of it, and to be *identified with it.* In *that* sense, I also have been maintaining that our Lord has not two bodies, but one. My witness does not contradict me, unless I quite misconceive the movement of his thought.[1]

But what is our author trying to express? Why does he take the trouble to mention that "we speak not of two bodies." There were no teachers who were using any such phrase, and whom he was anxious to oppose, surely. He is appealing to the doctrine of the Eucharist as a doctrine which all members of the Church hold in common, and from which, therefore, he may argue with the assurance that his premises will be granted. Then it must be that his only reason for suggesting that we do not speak of "two bodies" is precisely that we are dealing with two things which we might call two bodies, but which because they are unified in the holding of our Lord, we call "one body," after all. Is this not so? Let us consider! Our author is arguing against the heresy which so divides our Lord's humanity from His Divinity as to make not only two natures, but two beings. Now to say that our Lord's glorified body, present (in one manner of being) in heaven, and present (in another manner of being) on the altars of our Churches, is one and the same body, would not help in the least to show that our Lord's Godhead and our Lord's humanity made up one Person. No! The argument here presented requires that we should see two things which are genuinely distinct, one from the other, brought together in such wise that the result of their holding is one, because it is a holding by one Divine Person. That makes a real argument from analogy. To put my point in another way, I will

[1] Compare the teaching of S. Chrysostom in his *Homilies on Corinthians,* as given in Lecture VI, p. 150.

express it thus. That the same thing twice over is really one thing is no proof whatever that two different things can be brought under a glorious unity. That the eucharistic body of our Lord, though distinct from His natural body, is yet so made one with His natural body in the holding of His one Divine Person, that we speak not of two bodies, but of one body, is precisely what leads up to the thought that humanity and Divinity may be held together in a similar fashion in the holding of one Divine Person, one single Son of God.

I think that I can see how a Nestorian could have met that particular argument, while I do not see how a Eutychian could have evaded the argument from the Eucharist brought against *his* heresy by Theodoret. With no more sympathy, I trust, for the one heresy than for the other in my own mind, I find Theodoret's argument from the Eucharist weighty, as against Eutychian error, and this argument of the unknown writer weak, as against Nestorian error. But if this writer had held that the eucharistic body of our Lord and His natural body were in no wise distinct entities, and could not in any sense be spoken of as two, then (I should say) he could not even have dreamed of finding any argument here at all.[1]

CONCLUSION

I should have been glad to add here the testimony (a very striking and important testimony, as it seems to me) of S. John of Damascus, that great teacher and guide of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church, but space

[1] Completing here a survey of the patristic teaching of five centuries, I invite attention to the view of the same writer taken by an eminent Roman Catholic scholar, Mgr. Batiffol. See Note H, p. 261.

fails me, and I must print what I have to offer from his writings in an Appendix. It remains to spend a few minutes in friendly talk about the relation of this ancient Christian thought, which I have been presenting, to the Christian thought of to-day.

And, first, I know that the enquiry will shape itself in the minds of some who hear me, "How can this doctrine, that the bread of the Eucharist and our Lord's body in the Eucharist are one and the same thing, be squared with the language of our own Anglican formularies, the language which speaks of the Sacrament as having two parts, — an outward and visible sign, which is bread, and an inward part, or thing signified, which is our Lord's body?" My answer is, first, that our Anglican Reformation formularies were certainly intended by those who framed them to be very generously inclusive. I sometimes think that they were meant to comprehend everybody who could at all be comprehended by them, — I had almost said, that they were meant to take in everybody who could be taken in. Certain extremists, whom there was no hope of conciliating anyway, are roundly denounced in our famous "Articles of Religion," to catch the favor of men on the opposite side and make them feel that this reformed Church of England was really moving in the right direction. Nothing was said to make it impossible to keep any particular fishes in the net that could possibly have been expected to be kept. Where these framers came near treading on any toes, they meant to be understood as treading lightly.

What, then, would they have said of such a view as I have been endeavoring to present? Why, they would have observed, of course, that it was much nearer than the view of some of my critics to the language of the Black Rubric, — "The natural body and blood of our

Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." Then, also, these Anglican Reformers were far too well-read in theology and philosophy to have had any notion of treating "outward" and "inward" as terms of locality. They did not think of the inward power as being contained (in any local sense) in the outward sign. Doubtless, most of them did, in all their speculations, think of the bread and our Lord's body as being two different things, but they never *said* that they were two different things. They only said that in the Sacrament the eye of faith must see two facts, — a spiritual fact, to be discerned by an inner vision, and a material fact, to be discerned by an outward, natural vision. The two facts might concur in one substance, for anything that the Catechism says to the contrary. I allow myself to add a criticism, on one point, of the writer of the section on the sacraments in our Catechism. I admire him profoundly, but it seems to me that he fell into a manifest confusion in his use of that phrase, "inward part." In applying his definition of a sacrament to the cases of Baptism and the Eucharist, respectively, he falls into a confusion between what theologians have called the *Virtus Sacramenti* and what they have called the *Res Sacramenti.* For Baptism his "inward part" is a benefit to the soul, — "a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness." Then, to make his corresponding answer for the Eucharist truly to correspond, he should have said that the inward and spiritual grace of the Eucharist was a fresh incorporation with our Lord, a renewal of our hold upon His blessed body. But he was thinking deeply of the fact that all early Christian teaching told men that they did receive in bread and wine our Lord's body and blood, and he

wanted to say that same thing. It was a thing well worth saying, and, in fact, he did say it. I repeat my former assertion, that he does not *say*, and does not in any way necessarily *imply*, that the hallowed bread is not that very "body of our Lord, which is spiritually taken and received." He does not insist, though probably enough he did think, that the bread was one thing, and our Lord's body another. All that he meant to bind on the consciences of the Church's children, was that they should believe that in receiving the Sacrament they were receiving "verily and indeed" the body and blood of our Lord. If he could have imagined such an interpretation of the Fathers as I have been presenting, he might not have agreed with it in the least, but I am sure that he would not have claimed that it was now impossible for a loyal Anglican theologian to hold it.

Let me say further that while our Reformation formularies are certainly binding upon us, so far as that we must, as honest men, hold ourselves within their very broad limits, or give up ministering in the name of the Church which still imposes them, I must remind you of two points as to which I am sure that you will all agree with me. The first is that no theologian of eminence now maintains that the Anglican Reformation formularies are in themselves infallible and irreformable. The second, like unto it, is that the Reformation formularies do not really represent in all points the mind of our own Church of to-day. A large part of the thirty-nine Articles, for example, is occupied with subjects that even theologians do not spend much time in thinking about now. I do not care profoundly whether the thought and language of the Fathers agrees precisely with the thought and language of the divines who supported the throne of

Queen Elizabeth.[1] I am asking myself interestedly what this ancient thought, which I have been bringing out from the Church's early days, has to offer to modern men, thinking the thoughts that I meet with now, as I read their books and hear their talk.

And here let me say that while in these Lectures I have spent much time in criticizing the views of other men, and while I have taken up the attitude of impartially faulting all modern theories and their upholders, my purpose all through has been distinctly eirenical. I hold that because all modern theories of the eucharistic presence begin with a mistaken pre-supposition, therefore their followers have thrown away the key of truth, and the chaotic confusion which does actually exist in the modern world is the necessary result. But I find some hopeful indications of drawing nearer together among modern theologians, and I feel that the ancient theology has a ground to offer, on which they might come together more readily than on the lines which have been the fashion of the last thousand years.

Let me speak of approximations which modern thinkers have already been making, even along the lines of their modern pre-suppositions. Roman theologians and Anglican theologians of the Oxford School have, as it appears to me, been engaged, of late years, in minimizing that which was most offensive in their eucharistic doctrine to men who approached the subject with the same modern pre-suppositions, but with an opposite mental habit. They have dwelt upon the presence of our Lord's body in the Eucharist as "a spiritual presence," as "a presence after a spiritual manner," as the presence of "a body

[1] I am aware that the addition to the Catechism was made after the accession of King James. It remains that the theology involved was that of the preceding half century.

which is wholly a spiritual body," until there is left *no* presence, so far as I can discern, of any *material* thing at all. I think, myself, that they are on dangerous ground. I hold that they are coming perilously near to a doctrine that destroys our Lord's full and complete humanity. Certainly it was not a High Churchman who was reported, some years ago, as having preached a sermon in which he spoke of our Lord's Ascension as "a kind of ex-carnation of the Incarnation," but I fear that some modern teaching of Catholic theologians leans quite too far that way. Yet one thing is clear, and has promise in it. If such theologians can show the theologians of the Virtualist type that their doctrine includes no bringing down from heaven to the altar of any material thing at all, they will have gone a long way in the direction of healing the breaches of our modern religious thought.

Then there are what I may call "eirenic symptoms" on the other side. To be sure, the Protestant Churches pretty generally seem to me to be afflicted with a sore disease, which must run its course before there can be any eirenic discussions of value between us and them. They have suffered a fever of rationalism, and it will have to be followed, nay, is followed already, by the chill of a mere humanitarianism, without any revelation of truth, without any sacraments of grace, without any supernatural government of the world, to rest a sad or weary heart upon. Between those who hold to a supernatural religion and those who acknowledge nothing supernatural in human life except their own enlightened wills I cannot see that there can be any eirenic conference as yet, except as to that one point of difference, — "Have we a supernatural religion? or have we not?" But within our own Anglican Communion, and with such staunch believers in the things of God as Scottish Presby-

terians, for example, there has been a movement upwards from low views of the sacrament that may fairly be described as eirenic, too. There has been a rising tide of devotion to our Lord in connection with the sacrament of the altar, an enlarging use of the sacrament, a deepening sense of the value of the sacrament, a growing readiness to give expression to noble interior thoughts in noble outward forms. I venture to call this returning instinct for "forms" a return to the divine method. For surely the method of God Himself has always been a sacramental method, seeking to enshrine life in some fitting embodiment. As I look back to my own boyhood, and think of the bareness and chilliness of the sacramental teaching, and of the sacramental manifestation, the outward and visible vesture of sacramental observance, as they were sixty years ago, I feel that the Virtualist type has known great changes. It, too, has made large advances toward a common ground in its fuller appreciation of the sacramental idea.

But beyond these approximations of students whose diverse views are on both sides essentially modern views, I claim that the ancient theology offers a new and larger "eirenicon." If the follower of the Oxford School can receive my suggestion that the bread of the Eucharist was called our Lord's body in ancient times, with the understanding that that phrase meant that the bread was an embodiment of our Lord's life, it still remains open to this Anglican scholar to hold, exactly as he does now, that the Presence thus embodied is actually a Presence of our Lord in His natural body. The early Fathers do not seem to me to have had any such thought, but I grant that the thought might, nevertheless, be a perfectly true thought. So far as I can see, the two thoughts might perfectly well be held together.

I have been asked what bearing the thought which I have been presenting as that of the Fathers would have on such practical questions of to-day as those which gather around the words "Reservation" and "Benediction." I will be entirely frank, and say (at the risk of alienating sympathy that might be beginning to turn toward me from another direction) that so far as I can see, no Anglican theologian has anything to lose by accepting this view of the eucharistic Presence, which I seem to find in the ancient writers. Here is our Lord vouchsafing a most special Presence of Himself among us, giving Himself to be our food and sustenance in the power of His life, giving Himself to receive our adoration in a visible embodiment, waiting, it may be, to receive our visits to His Tabernacle, or to give us His blessing from the Monstrance. So far as I can see, the whole treasure of such pious hearts would remain to them unimpaired. For myself, I lean to the idea of the Bishop of Oxford that it would do the Church more good to learn to ascend to our Lord in heaven, than to make a Tabernacle for Him in which He may be visited on earth, and that we should gain by dwelling more on His presence in ourselves, in proportion to His presence in our sacramental elements. But what I have called the old theology finds our Lord in the sacrament as much as any modern theology. Nay, *more*, I think, for I myself can say, with S. Cyril of Alexandria, that, according to this belief, which I have learned from the Fathers, "Christ appears visibly in His body, and He permits and grants us to touch His holy flesh." I have learned to say that I can *see* and *touch* the very body of the Lord. What we ought to do with that wonderful gift is another matter. I will only say that I am convinced that devout men should have freedom to decide the question, each in his own

way. If one man holds that visits to the Tabernacle, and Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament are undesirable, let him not practice them. If another man craves with his whole soul such approaches to our Lord, let no Bishop, no General Convention, no force of unreasoning prejudice, no! no wise and careful theologian even, take the responsibility of hindering that soul from coming to God in its own natural way, even as the flower turns toward the light. Our Lord is there. He is drawing men. Let them come to Him, as each one sees the way.

Such language as this will grieve and repel my friends of the Virtualist type of mind, to whom the phrase, "The natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here," has always seemed the cardinal point of eucharistic theory, and to whom, therefore, the idea of our Lord's body appearing visibly on the altar seems at first view utterly repellent. But this view reiterates for them that formula, "The natural body and blood are not here." It provides abundantly for the satisfaction of *that* requirement of their minds. It presents our Lord's Person and our Lord's Life as the heavenly part of the sacrament, and says simply that the bread which receives these as a shrine is thereby made to be the body of our Lord, and the wine which receives these is made to be something which our Lord can rightly call His blood. This view does ask the Virtualist to go a step farther than he has ever gone before, and to acknowledge that our Lord really tabernacles in a special way in the material elements of the sacrament, even as He condescended, nineteen centuries ago, to dwell, all unrecognized as to his Deity, in the body of His flesh. But the theory here presented offers the Virtualist theologian an opportunity to take this forward step without contradicting his own reason, as

he has felt in time past that he would have to contradict his own reason, to accept the idea of "body present as spirit," and the other phrases which have troubled him in the older Tractarian teaching.

But then there are, I believe, a multitude of devout men among us, of the clergy as well as of the laity, who, though they are clear reasoners and devout students and faithful waiters upon God in His sacramental gifts, have never found any theory of the mystery of our Lord's eucharistic Presence, to which they could give their adhesion. I wonder yearningly if what I think that I have found to be the primitive Christian belief and teaching may not prove to be a perfectly possible belief and teaching for them, giving them the satisfaction of feeling that they can share the thoughts of generations of saints.

If I asked a group of Anglican theologians to name the greatest master of theology that the Anglican Communion has had in four hundred years before our time, I think that most of them would say, "Richard Hooker." Well, that good man seems to me to have been just one of those unsettled souls who have not been able to satisfy themselves with any modern theory of the eucharistic Presence. In his despair of such an intellectual satisfaction he fell back upon that famous phrase of his, — "Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this: 'Oh! My God, thou art true. Oh! My soul, thou art happy.'" There are many, many minds that need no philosophy of any matter: Hooker's phrase is quite enough for them. There are other minds that *must* think things out. I think, and hope, that there may be some who, if they could once be brought to taste the wine of Christian doctrine pressed out from the devout meditations of the early Fathers, would cry out with joy, "The old is better!"

APPENDIX I

WRITERS WHO PRESS THE PARALLEL OF THE INCARNATION AND THE EUCHARIST

(continued)

IV

S. John of Damascus, Monk, and Teacher of all the Orthodox East

It lies outside the lines of consecutive study of the Church's eucharistic teaching to present here a writer of the eighth century, but I need make no apology for abandoning those lines to introduce here that great teacher, S. John of Damascus. He is often spoken of as having lent powerful help to the movement of the Church's thought in the direction of the modern theory of Transubstantiation. For my part, I seem to find in him most remarkable testimonies in favor of what I have been describing as the ancient belief of the Church. But my chief reason for going far outside my appointed limits to include him in my study of the Fathers is that he seems to be to all the Orthodox East what S. Augustine of Hippo was for centuries in the West, the supreme representative of the Church's theology and philosophy, the teacher of teachers, and the interpreter by whose help all other Fathers were to be understood and measured.

Born in Damascus, of Christian parents, in the latter part of the seventh century, John Mansour had large advantages of education and culture, and came to be a

trusted officer in the great Mahometan court of the Caliphs of his day. After he had reached middle life, and had known the fascinations of luxury and power, he felt the call of a great renunciation, and gave himself to the more exclusive service of God as a monk in the monastery of Saint Sabas, a little out of Jerusalem. His death may be placed about A.D. 760.

My quotations from S. John of Damascus may well begin with his comments on 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. They press very strongly the identification of the eucharistic body of our Lord with His natural body, but they press just as strongly the thought that the eucharistic bread is itself made to be a body of our Lord. Further, we shall find S. John insisting that we ourselves, as the result of our communions, are not many bodies, but one. This last statement is to me extraordinarily interesting, because I find in it a confirmation by S. John of Damascus of my interpretation of that phrase of our anonymous author, "We speak not of two bodies, but of one body of the Lord." S. John of Damascus had read that treatise in which the phrase I have just quoted stands out so uniquely. He had read the treatise, and he quoted from it as a writing of S. John Chrysostom. It would seem as if that very passage was in his mind, when he wrote that *we* "are made not many bodies, but one." We *are* many bodies. Nothing can change that fact. But according to S. John, we become so identified with our Lord's body in heaven, that our existence as in so many separate bodies may be set aside, and dropped out of view. So, it would seem, he would understand the writer whom he mistakenly supposed to be Chrysostom, saying "we speak not of two bodies, but of one body." Two bodies there *are* in literal fact, but their unification makes it right to speak as if they made but one. In this case I have

preferred to present my comments on the author, before presenting his own words. I will now read the extracts from the *Commentary* without interruption or further explanation.

"*The cup of blessing which we bless.*

When he says 'blessing,' he speaks of the Thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστίαν*), and speaking of the Thanksgiving he unfolds in its entirety the treasury of the beneficence of God, and calls to mind His great bounties, in that when we had no hope, and were without God in the world, He made us His brethren and joint-heirs with Him.

Is it not a communion of the blood of Christ?

That same blood which is in the cup, He says, is that which flowed from the side,[1] and of that we partake.

The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of the Christ?

And why did he not say a participation (*μετοχήν*)? Because he wanted to make it clear that there was something more, and to show the greatness of the union (*συνάφειαν*). For not by participation and reception only, but also by being made one with Him do we communicate with Him. Even as the body has been made one with the Word, so are we being united with Him by means of this bread.

[1] The Greek is *τὸ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ ἐκεῖνό ἐστιν τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς πλευρᾶς ῥεῦσαν.* I think that *ἐκεῖνο* must qualify *τὸ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ.* If it belongs to *τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς πλευρᾶς ῥεῦσαν*, the translation is, "That which is in the cup is that same which flowed from the side." To one clause or the other *ἐκεῖνο* lends a strong demonstrative force. The Greek cannot mean simply, "That which is in the cup is that which flowed from the side," as in the translation in the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, as if *ἐκεῖνο* was not there at all. The saying is very emphatic, as one writes a phrase in italics in a modern style.

Because we, the many, are one bread, one body,
for we all of us partake of the one bread.

'Why do I speak of a communion?' he says. 'We are that body itself' (αὐτό ἐσμεν ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα). For the bread is a body of Christ, and the receivers are made (γίγνονται) not many bodies, but one. Even as the bread, while composed of many grains, has been made one, so that the grains are no more seen, but yet they exist in themselves, with their distinction lost to view in their union, so also are we united with one another, and with the Christ. For we are not nourished, one of one body, and another of another body, but all of the same [Greek, αὐτοῦ 'of itself,' but English idiom requires us to say, 'the same']. Wherefore he says, 'For we all of us partake of the one bread.' But if of the same [here we have really τοῦ αυτοῦ], and we are all made to be the same thing [εἰ τὸ αὐτὸ γιγνόμεθα πάντες], why do we not also show the same love, and thus become one?" [1]

It may be noted in passing, that in his first and second *Discourses on the Holy Images* John of Damascus uses such an argument as this against the opponents of the veneration of images:

"Is not the life-giving table, which ministers to us the bread of life, material? Are not the gold and silver, from which crosses and patens and chalices are made, material? Above all these, are not the body and blood of our Lord material?" [2]

Of course, his point is, first, that material things are not to be despised with a Manichean feeling that what is material is evil, and, second, that God does plainly use material means for spiritual ends and as vehicles of spiritual power. But could he fairly have appealed to our Lord's body and blood as material, if he had regarded them as raised from the material to the spiritual order? or even as present on the altar "only after the manner of

[1] *P. G.* 94, 648. [2] *On the Images*, I. 16; *P. G.* 94, 1245.

spirit"? It seems to me that he could not. But I do not mean to make much of this point. Certainly, some of the Fathers did sometimes use arguments that were not fair. I will only say that it seems to me simpler to understand the arguments as referring to the consecrated bread and wine, named, as the Fathers did so constantly name them, "the body and blood of our Lord," and regarded as unchanged in their material substance.

S. John of Damascus wrote an elaborate treatise on *The Orthodox Faith*. It may be found in the *Patrologia Graeca*, 94, and if the student will turn to Chapter 10 of Book IV, filling columns 1148 to 1153, he will find that it deals with the subject of the Eucharist. Some extracts follow:

"If then the word of God is living and powerful, and the Lord did all that He willed; . . . if the heaven and the earth, water and fire and air, and all their ordered belonging, and in sooth this much vaunted creature, man, were brought to full accomplishment by the word of the Lord; if the Divine Word by an act of His own will became man, and without seed of man made the blood of the holy and ever Virgin Mother to supply flesh for Him, can He not then make the bread a body of His own,[1] and the wine and water blood? He said in the beginning, 'Let the earth bring forth grass,' and even to this day, when the rain comes, it does bring forth its proper fruits, urged on and empowered by the divine command. God said, 'This is My body,' and 'This is My blood,' and 'This do in remembrance of Me,' and it is done, at His omnipotent command, until He come. For such was the saying, 'Until He come,'[2] and to this new husbandry there comes, through the Invocation, a rain, even the shadowing power of the Holy Spirit. For just as God made all things which He made by the operation of the Holy Spirit,

[1] The Greek is, *οὐ δύναται τὸν ἄρτον ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ποιῆσαι.*

[2] Of course, the reference is to 1 Cor. xi. 26, but the quotation is not accurate, *ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ*, probably by a slip of memory, for *ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ*.

so also the operation of the Holy Spirit performs those things which are beyond nature, which faith alone can receive. 'How shall this be to me?' said the Holy Virgin, 'seeing I know not a man?' And Gabriel the archangel answers, 'The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.' And do you now ask how the bread becomes a body of Christ, and the wine and water blood of Christ? I also say to you: 'The Holy Spirit comes on them, and makes them to be those things which are beyond reason and thought.'

"Further, bread and wine are employed, for God knows the infirmity of man, for in general man turns discontentedly away from everything that does not run in the well-worn ways of custom; and so, with His usual indulgence, He makes His supernatural creations by means of the things which men are accustomed to in nature; and just as in Baptism, seeing it is man's custom to wash himself with water and anoint himself with oil, God linked the grace of the Spirit with the oil and the water, and made it to be the water of regeneration, in like manner, seeing it is man's custom to eat bread and to drink water and wine, with them God linked His Deity and made them His body and blood, that through those things which are ordinary and natural we may come to have part in those things which are supernatural.[1]

Body is truly united with Deity, even the body which was born of the Virgin, not that the body which ascended comes down from heaven, but that the bread itself and the wine are transmade [*μεταποιεῖται*] into a body and blood of God."

I interrupt my quotation here to remark on questions of translation that come up in the last two sentences. It is the custom of the Greek Fathers in speaking of the natural body of our Lord to use the article. It is a very common thing with them in speaking of the eucharistic body to omit the article. I should not dream of insisting that a noun without the article in Greek must always be

[1] The Greek is, *ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ φύσιν γενώμεθα*, literally, "may become in those things which are supernatural."

translated by a noun without the article in English. I know better. The idioms of the two languages do not exactly correspond. But this I say confidently: When a Greek writer uses σῶμα (anarthrous),[1] he never means the same thing that he would mean if in the same phrase he wrote τὸ σῶμα. In the last sentence but one, I have written these words, — "with them God linked His Deity, and made them His body and blood," just as I should if the Greek had been τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ. But the words σῶμα and αἷμα had, in fact, no article, and the meaning was strictly, "made them to be a body and blood of Him," that is to say, "made them to be a body and blood for His use."

In like manner in the very last words quoted above, "transmade into a body and blood of God," it would

[1] For the help of students who do not read Greek, it may be well to offer an explanation of what is meant by "anarthrous." It refers to the use of a noun without the definite article in Greek. The Greek language has not an indefinite article, such as our "a" or "an." Greek cannot distinguish between "having fish for dinner" and "having *a* fish for dinner." It can distinguish "*the* fish" from "fish" or "a fish," but not these last from one another. It is true also that in Greek some great titles like "Lord" come to be used without the article (anarthrously in fact), when the phrase is used definitely, and means "the Lord." I have not discovered any indication that the words "body" and "blood" are thus used anarthrously when their meaning is a definite meaning. It is quite possible that when a Greek writer speaks of bread as being "made body of our Lord," to translate by "a body" might in a measure misrepresent the course of his thought. I hold it to be certain that to translate such a phrase by "the body" would be a clear misrepresentation of his thought. When the Greek writers say that bread and wine are made "body" and "blood," omitting the article, they mean that these elements are made to take on the quality of "body" or "blood," as the case may be. That is different from saying that these elements are made to be "the body and blood of the Lord," though, as I have constantly affirmed, that also might be said, and is often said, *in a sense*.

misrepresent S. John Damascene, and mistranslate Greek words, to put it "transmade into the body and blood of God." What is meant is that bread and wine are made over into things having the character of body and the character of blood respectively, and belonging to One who is God. I must call attention also to the phrase, "not that the body which ascended comes down from heaven." Of course, both Roman theologians and those of our own Oxford School would earnestly disown the idea that our Lord's glorified body "comes down from heaven" to be present in the Eucharist. Its presence is not local, they say. It does not move from place to place. I have before quoted Cardinal Newman as saying that "the body of our Lord does not move from place to place, when the Host is carried in procession." But look at the way in which the Damascene introduces his phrase. He does not say that our Lord's heavenly body is on the altar, "only you must understand that it does not leave heaven in order to be there." No! He says that the bread and wine become a body and blood of God, are joined to the glorified body and become one with it, but that that heavenly body is not there on the altar, though the body that *is* there is so joined with the body which is above as to be identified with it. That seems to me to be the only natural and unforced reading of this "not that the body which ascended comes down from heaven," introduced as the phrase is here.

I resume my quotation from the spot where I broke off. The Damascene is going to give us a little more in the way of interpretation of the mystery, even in the act of saying that he can say nothing more.

"But if you enquire how this happens, it is enough for you to learn that it is through the Holy Spirit, just as through the Spirit our Lord made flesh to be for Himself, subsisting in Him-

self, from the holy Theotokos. And we know nothing more, save that the Word of God is true and active and Almighty, while the method is unsearchable. But it is not a very bad way to put it, that as in nature the bread through being eaten and the wine and water through being drunk are changed into body and blood of him who eats and drinks, and do not become another body, different from the former one, so the bread of the preparation [1] and the wine and water are supernaturally changed by the invocation and presence of the Holy Spirit into the body of the Christ and into His blood, and are not two things, but one and the same."

The bread and wine which a man takes to himself for nourishment are changed into body, and do not become another body, different from the former one. So in the Eucharist, says our S. John, our Lord takes to Himself bread and wine to extend His power, and these elements are made to be body and blood for His use, but as an enlargement of His body which He had before, not as a separate and (so to speak) rival body. "But," it will be said to me, of course, "can you not see that S. John of Damascus flatly contradicts your own teaching? You tell us that the bread and wine of the Eucharist *are* made to be 'another body' and 'another blood' of our Lord." My answer is, as in the case of that nameless writer whose work S. John of Damascus admired and quoted, and who said that "we speak not of two bodies," that here are two forms of speech which may be used with equal truth and propriety. We may call the eucharistic body of our Lord and His natural body two distinct bodies, or one and the same body. We may say of the

[1] Greek, προθέσεως, referring, apparently, to the "table of prothesis" in the sacristy, or side-chapel, in an oriental church, and to the elaborate preparation of the elements before the "Little Entrance" in the Greek rites.

Church that it consists of many persons, or that it is one Person. S. Paul is our authority for that: "Ye are all one man in Christ Jesus." [1] Which of two things does John of Damascus mean to say, — that the elements become our Lord's glorified body and no other? Or that the elements become a distinct body and blood of our Lord, which yet are an extension of, and so are to be identified with, His natural body? I claim that it is only the latter interpretation of our saint, with which his illustration of the natural growth of human bodies by sustenance can be made to fit. Our food is added to the body we had before and becomes part of it, and loses its distinct value in becoming identified with our former body. But it is not changed into the identical body which we had before we ate this food. It becomes that body which we had before this eating, in a sense. It becomes identified with that body, and is a part of that body, and takes on the character of that body. But hold these two conceptions distinctly before your mind, — the body of a man about to take food and the food which he is about to take, and certainly the latter is not transmade into the former. Food becomes a man's body by being added to the body which the man had before. That is the crucial point. The eucharistic elements are supernaturally changed into our Lord's body and blood by being added to the body which He wears in heaven. That, or else this illustration given by the Damascene is no illustration, but only an example of utter intellectual confusion.

I must comment briefly on one more phrase of the extract. S. John says of the bread and of the wine and water that when they have been supernaturally changed

[1] Gal. iii. 28, *πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστέ*. That does not mean, "Ye are all one thing," but "Ye are all one Person."

they "are not two things, but one and the same." Plainly, he means that this is true of each element. I think that there will be no difference of opinion among students of the passage about that point. The bread, for example, is not two things, but one. With such a statement the Roman theologian has, of course, no difficulty. The bread and our Lord's body are not two things! No, indeed! The bread has been transformed into our Lord's glorified body, and has ceased to be. It may be remarked that this is a very strange use of the word "transformed." The Roman theology talks of changing one thing into another. It really teaches that one thing is annihilated to make a place for another. But let that pass. This particular statement, that the bread is not two things but one, will give a Roman theologian no difficulty. But I venture to suggest that to the students of the Oxford School it presents a difficulty to which I see no answer. To their thought, as to the thought of the whole primitive Church, the bread remains. The bread is one thing, and our Lord's glorified body is another thing. How then are these two things "not two things, but one"? My own thought is that S. John means here to say that in case of each of the eucharistic elements a common thing has a marked change of character, and becomes a very much greater thing, and so is called by a very much greater name, but it is one thing which is there all through, bearing both names. When George V was made king, he was not made to be some king that had formerly existed. He was made to have the character of king. But in being thus made to be what he was not before he was not two things, but one. Such, as I read S. John of Damascus, is his account of the supernatural change that makes bread and wine to be our Lord's body and blood.

Interesting parallels with earlier writers are frequent in our Damascene. As Dr. Stone points out in his *History* (I. 147), he suggests S. Ambrose in his use of illustrations from God's acts in the creation and in the Incarnation to throw light on the eucharistic miracle, and again he suggests S. Gregory of Nyssa in his use of the word "transmade," and in presenting the illustration from the turning of bread and wine into the body of a man who eats them. So now we shall find him following the example of Macarius Magnes in disowning the name of "type" for the consecrated elements. Of course, in this he separates himself from the speech of the Church generally through all the first four Christian centuries. But apparently his change of language does not involve any real change of doctrinal opinion. Only the obvious fact that the broken bread and the poured wine do make natural pictures, "symbols," as we say, or "types," of our Lord's broken body and shed blood seems to him utterly unimportant, as compared with the meaning of the consecrated elements as spiritual powers, and as being really a body and blood of the Lord, and he has learned to fear that some one might get from such a word as "type" an impression of unreality. Here are his words:

"The bread and wine are not a figure [*τύπος*] of the body and blood of Christ, but the Lord's very body, deified [*αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα Κυρίου τεθεωμένον*], since the Lord said, 'This is My body,' not 'This is a figure of My body,' and not 'figure of the blood,' but 'blood.'" [1]

In his next paragraph, it will be found, he makes an interesting use of Isaiah's vision of the coal brought by a seraph from the altar of burnt-offering to touch the

[1] The reference is still to Chapter 13 of Book IV of the Treatise *On the Orthodox Faith*.

prophet's lips. It was a favorite type of the Eucharist in the patristic teaching. Interesting examples will be found in Dr. Pusey's Catena, pp. 119–131. It should be observed, however, that Dr. Pusey assumes that the "fire" in the coal is our Lord's body, or perhaps I should rather say, "the *totus Christus*." In such patristic passages as I know, where it is made clear what the writer's thought was, it is our Lord's Deity. Of course, that is so when the coal is taken as a type of the Incarnation. Then the humanity of our Lord is the "coal," and His Divinity is the "fire." It will be seen that S. John of Damascus keeps close to the customary parallel of the Incarnation and the Eucharist, and explains the "fire" as being our Lord's Deity, while the "coal" is the material element in which He embodies Himself.

"Let us draw near with an ardent desire, and, with our hands held in the form of the cross, let us receive the body of the Crucified, and applying our eyes and lips and foreheads,[1] let us partake of the divine coal. . . . Isaiah saw a coal. But a coal is not plain wood, but wood united with fire. In like manner the bread of the communion also is not plain bread, but bread united with Deity. But a body which is united with Deity is not one nature, but two, but the body has one nature, and the Deity which is united to it has another, and the sum of both is not one nature, but two."

It does seem manifest that S. John is really speaking here of a union of bread and Deity all through, and not of a union of our Lord's natural flesh and His Deity. The two natures that meet in the Eucharist are not

[1] Dr. Pusey gives on his p. 130, an interesting, but impossible translation, "having signed eyes and lips and brow." That sense would require that the nouns should be in the dative, even if "cross" or "sign" could be dispensed with as a direct object of "applying." But the nouns are all in the accusative, as being themselves direct objects of the verb.

human flesh and Godhead, but bread and Godhead. But bread thus "united to Deity," thus adopted by the Incarnate Word, becomes truly a flesh for Him, a body, and wholly one with His natural flesh.

It may be added that a little later in this chapter the Damascene says that if some of the Fathers, like Basil, did call the bread and wine "antitypes," they were speaking of the elements before consecration. That is, of course, an entire misunderstanding on his part, and it seems possible that he was not altogether satisfied with his own explanation of the matter. At any rate, in the last paragraph of the chapter he uses the word, himself:

"And they are called antitypes of the things to come, not as being really Christ's body and blood,[1] but because now by means of these we partake of the Deity of Christ while hereafter we shall partake of it spiritually [νοητῶς, regularly opposed by Greek writers to αἰσθητῶς, "by way of sense"], by means of the vision only."

[1] I am bound to say that I am sure that S. John Damascene had no idea of saying that the consecrated elements were not really Christ's body and blood. If I understand what seems in English a rather awkward phrase, his thought is this: The consecrated elements are not called "antitypes" when viewed in their character of Christ's body and blood, a character which they do really possess. But comparing our earthly experience of feeding on Christ by sacrament with the still higher and closer and more gloriously effective union with Him which His people will have in the life of heaven, this earthly communion may be said to be an antitype of that which shall be hereafter.

Of course, this is an utterly different use of such a word as "antitype" from that of the earlier writers. That idea of the material elements, as symbols of a body broken and a blood shed, which so deeply interested the early Christian writers, had lost interest in the Church's mind and heart, and was not even remembered, so that when men met with it they did not know how to explain it. That was a very great, and I will say, a very regrettable, theological change.

This, it will be seen, is a different use of the word "antitype" from that of the earlier writers, but it applies the word, as they did, to the elements after consecration. That is a very unimportant point. I offer it partly as a matter of justice to the memory of a great Christian writer, showing him feeling his way out of a mistake. Far more important is the illustration which comes out here of the habitual teaching of S. John of Damascus. He instructs us that by means of a body which is bread, and blood which is wine, we partake of our Lord's Deity. That is, in sum, his account of the Holy Eucharist.

APPENDIX II

THE DECLARATION OF THE ICONOCLASTIC COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE (A.D. 754)

"Let them be glad and rejoice and be full of boldness who with most sincere soul make and desire and reverence the true image of Christ, and offer it for salvation of soul and body, which the Divine High Priest, having taken upon Him a substance [*φύραμα*] which is ours and wholly derived from us, hath at the time of His voluntary passion delivered to His faithful ones as a figure and most clear memorial. For when He was about to give Himself up voluntarily to His gloriously-hymned and life-giving death, He took the bread and blessed it, and gave thanks and brake it, and distributing to them He said, 'Take, eat, for the remission of sins; this is My body.' In like manner also imparting the cup He said, 'This is My blood; do this for My memorial,' as though no other form under heaven was chosen by Him, and no other figure could image His Incarnation. Here, then, is the image of His life-giving body, as it is made honorably and worthily. For what did the all-wise God herein contrive? Nothing else but to show us men and make plainly clear to us the mystery which was accomplished in His dispensation, — that as that which He took from us is only material of human substance, which substance is perfect in all respects, but not bearing the likeness of any individual person, lest an addition of person should occur in the Godhead, so likewise He ordered His image to be offered as selected matter, in fact, the substance of bread, not bearing the likeness of human form, lest idolatry should be introduced. As,

therefore, that which is naturally Christ's body is holy, as having been made divine [θεωθέν] so, plainly, that also which is His body by adoption [θέσει], or His image, is holy, as being made divine by grace through a certain consecration. For this, as we have said, our Master Christ did bring about, it being His good pleasure that, as He made the flesh which He took on Him divine by its own natural consecration arising out of union with Himself, so also the bread of the Eucharist, as no untrue image of His natural flesh, should be made a divine body by the descent of the Holy Spirit, through the mediation of the priest who makes the oblation, transforming what is common to what is holy. In fine, the flesh of the Lord with its natural gifts of life and thought was anointed with Divinity by the Holy Ghost; in like manner also the God-given image of His flesh, the divine bread, was filled with the Holy Ghost, together with the cup of the life-giving blood from His side. This, then has been shown to be no untrue image of the Incarnation of Christ our God, as was said before, which He Himself, the true Maker and Quickener of nature, hath delivered with His own voice." [1]

The above declaration seems a plain setting forth of the idea that by an operation of the Holy Ghost, and "by grace through a certain consecration," dimly discerned, not definitely understood, the very elements of bread and wine are made to be (not *contain*, or *carry*, or *effectively represent*) a divine body, a divine blood, which may indeed be identified with the body and blood seen on the cross, but are not identical with these.

I know that the Iconoclastic Council has an unhappy reputation with Catholic theologians. Even so Protestant a writer as Archbishop Trench quotes approvingly the earlier language of Dean Milman, who said, "Hatred of images, in the process of the strife, might become, as

[1] Hardouin, *Concilia* iv. 368, 369; Stone I. 148–150.

it did, a fanaticism, it could never become a religion. Iconoclasm might proscribe idolatry, but it had no power of kindling a purer faith." Certainly the Iconoclastic movement was base. It remains that the theology of the 338 bishops in regard to the Eucharist seems to be entirely in accord with that of S. John of Damascus, whom in the matter of image-worship they most severely condemned. On the other hand, the Second Council of Constantinople (A.D. 787), restoring all things, anathematized the members of the Council of 754, and approved, though they did not adopt as a conciliar decree, a statement in which it was roundly asserted that when the Fathers of old time called the bread and wine types and figures of our Lord's body and blood they were speaking of the elements before consecration. The statement further denounces the idea that the divine oblation is made "by adoption" as "sheer madness," and says that the use of the word "image" for the consecrated elements is "insane." If this was intended to indicate a real cleavage in eucharistic doctrine, it must be said that it was the Iconoclastic Council that showed in this particular the truer understanding of the Church's past. But I think that rather the tradition of eucharistic belief and teaching was still unbroken. The habit of disowning the old language, which had been so free in calling the eucharistic body and blood "figures" and "symbols" and "types," was an unhealthy habit. It was a sign of a coming change. But S. John of Damascus seems to teach the old ideas, though he was beginning to dislike and shrink away from the old words. At any rate the 338 bishops stand for a theological tradition that is by no means negligible. I think that it was a genuinely primitive tradition.

NOTE A

OF DR. PUSEY'S NOTE ON "IN, UNDER, WITH THE BREAD AND WINE," AS USED BY THE FATHERS

In Dr. Pusey's Catena (pp. 131–134), he has a Note on the use of the prepositions "in, under, with," as expressing the relation of our Lord's body and blood to the elements of bread and wine, in the language of the Fathers. His object is to show the continued existence of the bread and wine after the consecration, and most of his passages stand good for that purpose. His own interpretation of the passages which he brings forward would have a further consequence, of proving what was with him, of course, a constant assumption, that the bread and our Lord's body were two different things, and correspondingly that the wine and our Lord's blood were two different things. I have ventured the assertion that I have not found in the writings of the Fathers of the first five centuries any language which fairly carries this implication, that in the Eucharist the consecrated bread is a vehicle or veil of our Lord's body, and the consecrated wine a vehicle or veil of our Lord's blood. I feel bound, therefore, to examine the passages offered by Dr. Pusey in detail.

He presents the names of ten writers flourishing before A.D. 550. It may be interesting to tabulate them.

1. Tertullian.
2. S. Cyprian.
3. S. Hilary of Poictiers.
4. S. Cyril of Jerusalem.

5. S. Ephraim.
6. S. Epiphanius.
7. S. Augustine.
8. S. Chrysostom.
9. S. Cyril of Alexandria.
10. S. James of Sarug.

1. and 2. The passages from Tertullian and S. Cyprian have been examined in Lecture II. Tertullian's phrase, "In the bread is understood His body," seems to be plainly an example of what I have called the "in" of identity. Dr. Stone says, "He interprets the words of institution as placing our Lord's body under the head of, or in the category of, bread." S. Cyprian speaks of our Lord's blood as *appearing* in the cup, — exactly what it does not, according to the Roman doctrine and that of the Oxford School, — but he does not speak of our Lord's blood as being, or seeming to be, in the wine. I must repeat here, what I have said in Lecture II, that Dr. Pusey's statement, "The 'cup' in the Fathers is altogether equivalent to the 'element of wine,'" is a statement altogether unwarranted. In that very quotation from S. Cyprian we have mention of a condition "when the cup is without that wine whereby the blood is set forth." When S. Cyprian speaks of our Lord's blood as being "in the cup," he means "in the chalice," and I hold that when he writes "blood," he means the consecrated wine.

These two witnesses are all that are presented for the first three hundred years of the Church's life. They do not contradict my statement that the Fathers never speak of the consecrated elements as vehicles or veils of our Lord's body and blood.

The next five witnesses named by Dr. Pusey are all of the fourth century.

3. S. Hilary of Poictiers. The quotations from this great, but difficult, writer are found in a short passage of his book *De Trinitate* (viii. 13–17). He is arguing that our Lord is one with the Father in Nature, and not merely in will, and he refers to the Eucharist as making us one in nature with the Father. If we are made of one nature with the Divine Father through the Word, the Word Himself cannot be any less than one in nature with the Father. Dr. Pusey's first quotation runs thus: "We truly receive the Word made flesh through the food of the Lord." The Latin is "*Vere Verbum carnem factum cibo Dominico sumimus.*" It is to be observed that nothing is said here of receiving our Lord's *flesh* at all. "We receive the Word-made-flesh." It is the Incarnate Word, not His flesh, that we are here said to receive. The Word-made-flesh is everywhere present, but His flesh is not everywhere present. Nothing is here asserted, then, concerning any presence of our Lord's natural flesh. The passage has nothing to do with the subject of this Note. Such being the case, it might seem not worth while to point out an uncareful piece of translation; but I prefer to take a passage where nothing of importance depends on it, to illustrate a certain weakness of Dr. Pusey's Catena. Dr. Pusey, whom Newman loved to call ὁ Μέγας (the Great One), was a man of wide reading, and an enormous accumulation of learning; but his translations from Latin and Greek writers are not always closely accurate. I do not complain that they are not closely literal. To be closely literal in translation is sometimes to fail of carrying over the intended meaning safely from one language to the other. But there are failures in accuracy. Here is an example. *Cibo Dominico* should be rendered, "by means of the food of the Lord." The word "*through*," care-

fully italicized in Dr. Pusey's Note, suggests much more in the direction in which his mind was turning than lies really in the Latin phrase.

The next quotation seems at first more telling. "We receive under the mystery the flesh of His own body." But *sub mysterio* will bear the rendering, "under a mystery," which will be a very different thing. Perhaps also the word "own" should be omitted. For both these corrections I have the authority of Dr. Pusey himself. On page 394 of the same book, he gives the (really accurate) rendering, "We truly receive under a mystery the flesh of His body." I take it that "under a mystery" means no more nor less than in "a sacramental way." It does not define. And *mysterium* is not equivalent to *sacramentum* with S. Hilary, for he speaks of "the mystery of the sacraments" (viii. 15).

Dr. Pusey says further that S. Hilary speaks of "the flesh to be communicated to us under the sacrament." This is a curious mistake. S. Hilary speaks of our Lord as mingling the nature of His flesh with the nature of eternity "under a sacrament of flesh to be communicated to us." There is nothing to indicate that the word "sacrament" refers to the elements, nothing about flesh being present under a certain material element, or being communicated under a certain material element. Dr. Pusey himself recognizes (on his own p. 394) that "under the sacrament" is in relation with "hath mingled." "Under the sacrament of the flesh to be communicated to us" is his own translation.[1] *Sub sacramento* would seem to mean "by way of sacrament." At any rate S. Hilary has nothing to say of our Lord's body being hidden under a veil of bread.

[1] The Latin is "et naturam carnis Suæ ad naturam eternitatis sub sacramento nobis communicandæ carnis admiscuit."

4. S. Cyril of Jerusalem is quoted as saying, "In the type of bread there is given to you His body, and in the type of wine, His blood." My own understanding of this passage would be that it is an example of the "in" of identity again, as in Tertullian's use. In receiving the consecrated bread we receive our Lord's body in a sense. All the Fathers call the bread our Lord's body, and most of them call it a *type* of his body. It is the same thing of which they speak under both names.

5. S. Ephraim's sayings have been examined in Lecture IV. He has not a single passage in which he speaks of our Lord's body as being in the bread of the Eucharist, or His blood in the wine. Always he speaks of some heavenly power as being in the elements, and that power (called "Spirit" and "Fire") would seem to be our Lord's Person, not His body (natural) or His blood.

6. S. Ephiphanius, like S. Ephraim, says that "the bread indeed is food, but the Might in it is for giving of life." There is nothing about our Lord's natural flesh being in the bread.

7. S. Augustine is represented by three sayings. In the *Sermon* itself Dr. Pusey had quoted the passage, "Our Lord Jesus Christ commended His body and blood in those things which are, out of many, reduced into some one." It would seem to be another example of the "in" of identity. And so may be understood the two other phrases: "Receive ye that in the bread which hung on the cross; receive ye that in the cup which flowed from the side." And again, "We drink His blood under the form and flavor of wine." All three sayings will certainly bear Dr. Pusey's understanding of them. They will bear another understanding equally well.

8. From S. Chrysostom only two phrases are suggested: "This which is in the cup is that which flowed from the

side, and of that do we partake"; and "The blood in the cup is drawn for thy cleansing from the undefiled side." These have no bearing at all. They are presented with an assumption that always in the Fathers to say, "the cup," is the same as to say, "the consecrated wine." The assumption is not well founded.

9. S. Cyril of Alexandria is presented as a witness with a single phrase, which seems to be a simple phrase of identification rather than of inclusion: "In the life-giving Eucharist we receive in bread and wine His holy flesh and precious blood."

10. S. James of Sarug, a Syrian who was made a bishop A.D. 519, is quoted (in the *Sermon*) as saying, "He from whom the spirits of fire have their glow, Him in bread and wine thou seest on the table." Of course, this stands good for the purpose of showing that the consecrated elements were regarded as being still bread and wine. But that which is seen in the bread and wine by the eye of faith is not said to be our Lord's body, but our Lord's Person.

No one of these ten writers seem to give any indication of distinguishing between bread and our Lord's body, or of looking upon the consecrated bread as a shrine of our Lord's body. On the other hand, I hail with joy the quotation given near the end of Dr. Pusey's Note which I have been analyzing, from S. Hesychius, a Presbyter of Jerusalem (about A.D. 425):

> "That mystery is at once bread and flesh."

I could not ask for a better statement of what I have been trying to convey.

Just outside the limit of writers flourishing before A.D. 550 comes an author not mentioned in the Note, but quoted in p. 38 of the *Sermon*, Facundus, Bishop of

Hermiana, in North Africa, who was deeply engaged in the controversy known as that of "the Three Chapters," on the side of the defense of the authors accused of Nestorian doctrine.

"The Sacrament of His body and blood which is in the consecrated bread and cup, we call His body and blood, not that the bread is properly His body, or the cup His blood, but because they contain in them the mystery of His body and blood."

Such is the careful language of Facundus. He makes it clear that to his mind the bread and wine are called our Lord's body and blood non-literally. He does not say that our Lord's body and blood are in the bread and wine. He has two opportunities to say that, and both times he says something else. "The *Sacrament* of His body and blood" is "in the consecrated bread and cup"; "they contain in them the *mystery* of His body and blood." The thing that Facundus is called in to say is just what he will not say.

The Venerable Bede (d. A.D. 735) is too late to be an important witness to primitive theological movements, and Theophylact (d. A.D. 1110) is of the last degree of unimportance.

NOTE B

OF OUR LORD'S PHRASE, "MY BLOOD WHICH IS BEING SHED"

I SUPPOSE that when men contend for the literal interpretation of Holy Scripture, they regard the opposite of "literal" as being "evasive." If, however, our Lord ever uses figurative language, to interpret *that* language literally would not be right, and would be precisely

"evasive." I do not care, then, to be literal in all my interpretations, but I do care a great deal about being straightforward. I must call attention to one more point in which certain eucharistic theories are not straightforward in interpretation.

In S. Matthew xxvi. 28, and S. Mark xiv. 24, and in the received text of S. Luke xxii. 20, we find our Lord speaking of His blood (or in S. Luke, of the cup which He had blessed) as "that which is being poured out for you" (*τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον*). Now that phrase cannot apply literally, it cannot be applied straightforwardly, to our Lord's natural blood. It is most true that our Lord was at that moment engaged in a great act of dedication of Himself to suffering and death. He was bringing Himself as a willing Victim to be slain, that He might become the supreme Sacrifice of the world. But it is simply not true that the blood in His veins was at that time being poured out. It was true of His sacramental blood, the consecrated wine. It was not true of His natural blood. The Vulgate Version gives *effundetur*, "shall be poured out," in S. Matthew and S. Mark, and *fundetur*, "shall be poured," in S. Luke, the change of tense from present to future carrying a serious change of meaning. Of our modern Revisions, the English Revision gives "which is shed" in S. Matthew and S. Mark, but recognizes in S. Luke that the phrase belongs to "cup," and not to "blood," and so gives "even that which is poured out for you." The American Revision honors itself by giving "poured out" in all three cases. But really to make a modern reader understand what was really meant, it should have been, "which is being poured out."

NOTE C

THE USE OF THE TITLE ΛΌΓΟΣ BY S. JUSTIN MARTYR AS A TITLE OF THE HOLY GHOST

Both in Bp. Kaye's valuable study of Justin Martyr and in the article *Justinus Martyr* in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, S. Justin is charged with confusing the operations of the Second and Third Persons of the Blessed Trinity. On the other hand, it is agreed that when he speaks of "the Spirit," or "the prophetic Spirit," he ascribes to Him exactly such operations as later theologians do. The ground of charge of "confusion" is that S. Justin repeatedly ascribes such operations to "the Word." I ask consideration for some facts which seem to point to the conclusion that S. Justin used the title "Word" (Λόγος) quite indiscriminately for the Son of God and the Spirit of God. If there be any "confusion," it is not in S. Justin's theology, but in his use of a word which in his time had not become technical, and now *has* become technical.

The first piece of evidence is found in the very passage quoted on p. 29. S. Justin speaks of our Saviour, as "having been made flesh by the Word of God." To represent the philosopher-theologian as having taught that our Lord was made flesh by Himself would be to represent him as individualist to the last degree. All Christian thought was filled with the idea that the Lord Jesus was in His human nature "conceived by the Holy Ghost." When, then, we read in an earlier chapter (xxxiii.) of the *First Apology*, "It is wrong to understand the Spirit and Power of God as anything else than the Word, who is also the First-begotten of God, as the foresaid prophet Moses declared, and it was This that

when it came upon the Virgin and overshadowed her, caused her to conceive," we must take our choice between two lines of explanation. We must either treat S. Justin as contradicting the Creed of his day, or we must recognize that he regarded the Force which proceeded from God as Word and Wisdom and Power as a dual Force, consisting of the Son and of the Spirit, and that he used such titles as freely of the One Person as of the Other. To add force to this dilemma we have in the closing words of that same chapter a further exclusive claim for the Power here described as "the Divine Word." "And that the prophets are inspired by no other than the Divine Word, even you [the Roman Emperors], as I fancy, will grant." "By no other than the Divine Word." Later theology may ascribe inspiration to the Divine Word in one view, and to the Divine Spirit in another. It would certainly say that inspiration was, at least mainly, an operation of the Holy Ghost. Here again, either S. Justin excluded Him from being the Great Inspirer (an office which he does actually ascribe to "the prophetic Spirit" over and over), or else he includes the Son and the Spirit under a common name.

But how, it may be enquired, could a second century theologian use the title "Word" indiscriminately for the Son and for the Holy Ghost? The answer is really very simple. "Word" (Λόγος) is a figurative expression, and as a figurative expression it was perfectly applicable to either the Divine Son or the Divine Spirit. Either Son or Spirit might perfectly well be described as the expression of God's thought to men. It is a commonplace of theological students that for some centuries the Wisdom Books of the Old Testament, and those of the Apocrypha, had been preparing the way for the revelation of the doctrine of the Trinity by their bold personification

of the Wisdom of God as His Eternal Companion, and as His Agent in the creation and government of the world. What has been too little noticed is the fact that S. John's great title Λόγος, which we translate as "Word," is only the most natural and obvious development of the Old Testament idea of the Divine Wisdom. "Wisdom" may be taken as a most natural word to be used to represent God's meaning, uttered or unuttered. But when men came to feel with a new vividness that God had *uttered* His meaning on a great scale, and was sending a Messenger, who yet was inseparable from Himself and part of Himself, to speak for Him to His world, it was to be expected that they would use such a word as Λόγος rather than Σοφία, "the *Expression* of God," rather than "the *Wisdom* of God," to convey this great new thought. I am aware that Λόγος was used by philosophers for Meaning Un-uttered, for Thought, or Reason, or Mind, in God, and not simply for Expression. But it remains that the first Christian writers who give us the word Λόγος for the Expression of God's Thought do not seem to have been philosophers. It would seem to be the case that they were attracted to the title Λόγος ("Word") as a substitute for the title Σοφία ("Wisdom"), precisely because to them Λόγος meant Thought *Expressed*, Thought uttered by God and heard by men. But this growing revelation of the Wisdom of God as a Power that was an inseparable part of God, and yet had a Personality of Its own, did, as a matter of fact, include the revelation of two Personalities, when the revelation came to be complete in Christ. This Wisdom of God was not one Person, but two. This Word of God spoke not with one Voice only, but with two Voices. As a further illustration of the workings of S. Justin's mind, let me point to Chapter xiv. of the *First Apology*, where we read of our

Lord that "He was no sophist, but His Word was the Power of God." I am sure that I am justified in capitalizing "Word" here, and treating the reference as a reference to the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit, which is the "Breath" of God, and the Expression, the Uttered Mind, the "*Word*," of God the Divine Father, is also the Spirit, the "Breath," the Expression, the "*Word*," of our Lord in His earthly ministry, and whether He speaks the Mind of Son or Father, He is always, and equally, the "Power" of God.[1]

I had been for years convinced that S. Justin really had this use of the word Λόγος, to us most curious, to him supremely natural; but I knew of no confirmatory evidence from any other early Christian writer. I am indebted to the Rev. Dr. C. C. Edmunds, Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament, in the General Theological Seminary, where these Lectures

[1] If any one should do me the honor to follow up this subject, and examine the references in Bp. Kaye's *Justin Martyr* (note on p. 87) care should be exercised. Bp. Kaye seems to have reversed the meaning of the passage just quoted, and taken it to mean, "His Word [Our Lord Himself] was the Power of God." Also there is a misleading reference to the *Dialogue with Trypho*, chapter cii., which contains a passage to which a tradition of mis-translation seems to attach. It is found in the *P. G.* 6, col. 713, and the Greek runs as follows: Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ κηρύξαι τὸν παρ' Αὐτοῦ Λόγον ἀνδρωθέντα, ὁ Πατὴρ θανατώσεσθαι Αὐτον ἐκεκρίκει, ὃν ἐγεγεννήκει. I take it that this means "For after His having proclaimed the Word that proceedeth from Him as having been made Man, the Father had adjudged that He whom He had begotten should be put to death." Contrast with this version that of the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library* (I. 250), — "For the Father had decreed that He whom He had begotten should be put to death, but not before He had grown to manhood and proclaimed the Word which proceeded from Him." (The Latin Version in the *Patrologia Graeca* is much worse.) In this passage, Bp. Kaye takes τὸν παρ' Αὐτοῦ Λόγον as meaning "the message given by God to the prophets," as in the translation of the A.-N. L.

were delivered, for calling my attention to a striking little book of 65 pages, Dr. Rendel Harris's *Origin of the Prologue of S. John's Gospel.* It is there shown abundantly, I think, that the term Λόγος was a sequel to (I think, myself, as I have tried to show above, that it was a perfectly natural development out of) the Σοφία of Proverbs viii. and Wisdom vii., and also that such titles as "the Wisdom of God," "the Power of God," "the Hand of God," and even "the Spirit of God," are used of both Son and Spirit. The finest example of this confusion of titles is found in the book *Ad Autolycum* of S. Theophilus of Antioch (ii. 10; *P. G.* 6, col. 1064, 1065):

"This Word is called Beginning (Ἀρχή) . . . It was He who, being the Spirit of God, and the Beginning and the Wisdom and the Power of the Most High, descended on the prophets and through them discoursed of the creation of the world and all other matters. Not that the prophets themselves were present at the creation of the world; but what was present was the Wisdom of God that was in it, and His Holy Word that was always with Him."

One sees here the beginning of recognition that in the Creation-story place must be made for two Companions of God, and not One only. In Chapter xv. of the same book Theophilus comes out quite clearly. In this passage the word "Trinity" (τριάς) appears for the first time. The three days of creation before the making of the great luminaries are said to be "types of the Trinity, i. e., of God, and His Word, and His Wisdom." Here is both recognition of the Three Divine Persons, — that recognition was not new, — and also recognition of the need of using particular terms as distinctive of the Second and Third Persons. But Dr. Harris is quite justified in speaking of an earlier time — Theophilus is about a generation later than Justin — which was marked by "a

Christian Duality, the Holy Spirit being not yet come, in a theological sense, because the Divine Wisdom has not been divided into *Logos* and *Pneuma*." Harris, p. 49.

This is going far afield from my eucharistic subject. My excuse is that I was quite sure that without some elaboration of defense, I should be assured that my claim that "the Word that proceeds from Him" meant the Holy Spirit, was utterly foundationless and absurd, while I think it to be, on the other hand, a secure inference, and the key to the interpretation of the passage where those words appear.

I may add that it is Theophilus (*Ad Autolycum* ii. 18) who first shows that he recognizes that the Creative Hand of God must be described as *two* Hands. He has been saying that after creating everything else "by Word," God felt that for the one great act of the creation of man He must use His Hands. So "as if needing help, God is found saying, 'Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness.' He hath not said, 'Let Us make,' to any one save to His own Word, and to His own Wisdom." Later, in Irenaeus, one will find mention of "the Hand of God" as His instrument in creation, and again of "the Hands," and when Hands are named, it will be these two, — God's Word and God's Wisdom. But the clear distinction of *two* Hands of God took time.

It may be worth while to invite any student who may pass from the reading of this note to an examination of Dr. Harris's book to the parallel (and contrast) of the uses of Λόγος and Σοφία. Λόγος ("Word") is used in early Christian thought, first of our Lord, then of our Lord and of the Holy Spirit alike, and then, finally, as a distinctive title of our Lord, the Divine Son. Σοφία ("Wisdom") is used first of our Lord, then of our Lord and of the Holy Spirit alike, and then as a distinctive

title of the Holy Spirit, as by Theophilus and Irenaeus. The use of Σοφία as a distinctive title of the Spirit, not having a great Scripture passage like S. John i. 1 to back it up, and having, on the other hand, 1 Cor. i. 30 ("Christ, who was made unto us Wisdom") to warn students against pressing it unduly, has never so prevailed as to blind men's eyes to the possibility of applying it to the Divine Son. Without such safeguarding, the title Λόγος has come to seem to be a really exclusive possession of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity.

NOTE D

ON SOME PASSAGES OF TERTULLIAN WHICH SEEM TO HAVE BEEN MISUNDERSTOOD BY TRANSLATORS

Tertullian read in his Version of the Book of Jeremiah (xi. 19), *Mittamus lignum in panem ejus*, "Let us cast wood upon his bread," where we read, "Let us destroy the tree with the fruit thereof." The present Hebrew text means literally, "Let us destroy the tree in its bread," the translators holding that "bread" is used poetically for "the power to nourish." The LXX translators had evidently another Hebrew verb before them.

In this phrase Tertullian and other early writers saw plainest prediction of the cross of Christ and of His body. As they would put it, the prophet here called our Lord's body by the name of bread. Tertullian himself refers to this phrase of the prophet Jeremiah in three passages of his writings, *Adversus Judaeos*, x., and *Contra Marcionem* III. 19, and IV. 40.[1] In all three

[1] *P. L.* 2, 668, 669; 2, 376; 2, 491, 492.

passages Tertullian refers to acts of figurative meaning, — our Lord's calling bread His body, and the prophet's calling our Lord's body bread. The general sense of the passages is beyond question, but a certain curious ambiguity of the Latin language has betrayed translators into error in rendering a few phrases. All Latin scholars know well that such English sentences as "I call the king a wise man," and "I call the wise man a king," may be represented by the same Latin words. *Regem sapientem appello* will stand for one of these meanings as well as for the other. If there were no emphasis on either of the object-words, it may be thought that the direct object would be more likely to be put first by a Latin writer. But the first place in the sentence may be taken as a place of emphasis, and if the writer desired to emphasize his secondary object, he would by all means put it first, — "A king do I call the wise man." Order of words does not entirely clear the ambiguity of a Latin sentence as to which of two object-words is primary object, and which is secondary object.

Here, then, is the Latin of the passage from the *Adversus Judaeos:*

"*Utique in corpus Ejus lignum missum est. Sic enim Christus revelavit, panem corpus Suum appellans, cujus retro corpus in panem figuravit propheta.*"

The following is the translation of the Ante-Nicene Fathers (III. 166, American Edition):

"Of course on His body that wood was put; for so Christ has revealed, calling His body 'bread,' whose body the prophet in by-gone days announced under the term bread."

I submit that in this place *panem corpus Suum appellans* certainly means, "calling bread His body," and not,

"calling His body bread." As a simple matter of fact, our Lord did *not* call His body bread, and Tertullian did not think of Him as having done so. There is no reference here to S. John vi. 51, or 58. Our next quotation will show Tertullian (in a precisely similar sequence of thought) arguing solely from the account of the Institution of the Eucharist given in the Gospel according to S. Luke. And there is nothing in that Gospel to justify such a phrase as "calling His body bread." That is my first point. The same criticism will come up in connection with each of the two other Tertullian passages with which I am to deal.

But further, and this is a more important point by far, the translator seems to have missed the idea of Tertullian's word *retro*. He renders it, "in by-gone days." But *retro* has no such meaning of itself. It means "backward," or "in reverse direction," or "back of us." That last meaning entitles us to render *quod est retro*, "what is past," or even to render *omnes retro principes*, "all the chiefs of old times." But look at this passage. If the writer had wanted to say that this act, *figuravit*, took place "way back in the old days," he would, of course, have put *retro* closely with *figuravit*. What he *does* is to say, *cujus retro corpus in panem figuravit*. The *body* is represented as going *the reverse way* somehow. Plainly, the meaning is, — "calling bread His body, whose body in reverse fashion the prophet translated (in the language of figure) into bread."

The thought seems crystal clear. Our Lord called bread His body, in a mystical fashion. The prophet Jeremiah had, in a mystical fashion which was exactly the reverse of this, called the Lord's body "bread."

The second of these Tertullian-passages (*Adv. Marcionem* III. 19) runs as follows:

"*Sic enim Deus in Evangelio quoque vestro revelavit, panem corpus Suum appellans, ut et hinc jam Eum intelligas corporis Sui figuram pani dedisse, cujus retro corpus in panem propheta figuravit.*"

Again I give the version of the Ante-Nicene Fathers (III. 337):

"For so did God, in your own Gospel even,[1] reveal the sense, when He called His body bread, so that for the time to come you may understand that He has given to His body the figure of bread, whose body the prophet of old figuratively turned into bread."

Here besides the old mistake of "when He called His body bread" for "calling bread His body," we have the astonishing translation, "He has given to His body the figure of bread," when the plain meaning is

"so that even from hence [from our Lord's words recorded by S. Luke] you may understand that He has given to bread to be a figure of His body."

The misunderstanding of *retro* is repeated, but *figuravit in panem* is rendered justly. Again, as in the *Adversus Judaeos*, we have the opposition of our Lord's calling bread His body in a mystical sense, and the prophet, "in reverse fashion," calling the Lord's body "bread" in a mystical sense, "the Lord Himself designing [so Tertullian continues here] to give by and by an interpretation of the mystery." I note, as I pass, that Dr. Pusey (on his p. 97) gives a just, though not literal, translation of both these passages, rendering *panem corpus Suum appellans*, as I have done, "calling bread His body," but Dr. Pusey misquotes the Latin of the

[1] It will be remembered that Marcion accepted no Gospel but that of S. Luke.

second passage, giving *cujus retro in corpus panem* for *cujus retro corpus in panem*. He gives fairly the right meaning, but a wrong Latin.

Passing to the third of my passages (*Adv. Marcion.* IV. 40), I will give the Latin of the more important sentences:

"*Acceptum panem, et distributum discipulis, corpus illud Suum fecit, 'Hoc est corpus Meum,' dicendo, 'id est, figura corporis Mei.' Figura non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus. . . . Cur autem panem corpus Suum appellat, et non magis peponem, quem Marcion cordis loco habuit?*"

I will refer to my translation of these words in Lecture II. (p. 40), for my own understanding of them. The translation in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* quite overlooks *illud* in the former portion, and renders, "made it His own body *by* saying, 'This is My body,' that is, the figure of My body." Dr. Pusey translates *illud*, but renders the phrase, "that body of *His own*," for which I see no sufficient ground. The idea of introducing *illud* seems to be, "that thing which the Church knows, which is in some sense His body," or possibly "that body in which He clothes Himself for a particular purpose."

In the second portion, the translation of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (III. 418) gives us, "Why call His body bread," and Dr. Pusey, "Why doth He call His body bread?", etc. But certainly, the thought is "Why does our Lord take *bread*, rather than some other thing, to be a figure of His body?" Later, Tertullian goes on to mention the prophecy of Jeremiah, as in the other quotations, and adds this phrase:

"And thus the Illuminator of the things of old declared plainly what He meant by the bread, calling bread His body."

The idea is that our Lord as *Illuminator antiquitatum* (a fine phrase) showed what the bread meant in Jeremiah's

prophecy, when in the upper room He called bread His body. Both the *A-N. F.* and Dr. Pusey's volume reverse the meaning in this place, as the *A-N. F.* had done before, and translate "calling His body bread."

As I have pointed out before, Tertullian had two pieces of figurative language before his mind, one of our Lord, calling bread His body, as set forth in the Gospel narrative, and one of an ancient prophet, giving to our Lord's body, in a prophetic picture, the name of bread. To ascribe to our Lord any act of calling His body bread in interpreting this language of Tertullian is hopelessly to confuse what Tertullian was trying to say. Whether it is fair to charge Tertullian with thinking of our Lord's words as "figurative" in the modern sense, that is, as non-literal, will be considered in the next Note (Note E).

NOTE E

ON THE MEANING OF *FIGURA* IN THE PHRASE, *FIGURA CORPORIS MEI*

I HAVE not referred in my Lectures in the warning of Dr. Darwell Stone (*History*, I. 29–31), that the use of such words as "figure," "symbol," and "type" by the Fathers is different from the use of such words in modern writing. Dr. Stone quotes Prof. Harnack as stating "a crucial difference with great clearness." These are the words referred to, from the *History of Dogma:*

> "What we nowadays understand by 'symbol' is a thing which is not that which it represents; at that time 'symbol' denoted a thing which in some kind of way really is what it signifies."

I remark that even in our modern use there are two quite different levels of "symbol" and "figure." A

picture of a great monarch is one sort of symbol; an ambassador, armed with proper credentials from "His Majesty," is quite another. Each "represents" the sovereign; but it may be said of the ambassador that he, at any rate, "in some kind of way really is what [he] signifies." Certainly the Fathers looked upon the sacraments as "symbols" of this superior sort.

But Dr. Harnack falls below his usual "great clearness" here. What does he mean by "in some kind of way"? I venture to suggest that he does not know, himself, and therefore does not tell us. That phrase, "in some kind of way," posits an unsolved difficulty, and does it without the clearness of open confession,—"We moderns cannot make head nor tail of it." I am not satisfied that any proof has been offered that the ancients used "symbol" and "figure" in a different sense from the moderns, except that in Christian theology the ancients used such words in a way which modern theologies cannot interpret satisfactorily. I repeat my own suggestion, that the key to the difficulty lies not in differing uses of the words "symbol" and "figure" and "type," as between them and us, but in differing uses of the words "body" and "blood," as between the mind of the ancient, and the mind of the modern, Church. When the Church saw a natural body of our Lord and a eucharistic body, and distinguished (while it also identified) the two, it was supremely natural for the Church to call consecrated bread our Lord's body, and also a "figure" of our Lord's body. The use of the word "figure" was quite like our own.

But in regard to Tertullian in particular, Dr. Stone refers to an interesting examination of his use of *figura* (in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, VII. 595) by Mr. C. H. Turner, of Magdalen College, Oxford. Mr. Turner acknowledges freely, and I have no doubt that Dr. Stone

would acknowledge, that Tertullian does sometimes use *figura* quite in our modern fashion, as opposed to reality, to what a Latin writer would call *veritas*. On the other hand, he shows, most convincingly, that Tertullian used the word *figura* where some such phrase as "precise presentment" [1] might stand in English. Well, let it be remembered that we use the word "figure" for realities over and over, ourselves. We speak of "a fine figure of a man," of seeing "terrible figures of armed riders dashing through the streets," of a "river of no inconsiderable figure." Oh! yes! Even in English a figure may be a very real thing. I may add that even where Tertullian brings *figura* and *veritatis corpus* into one sentence, it is by no means necessary to suppose that he opposes them one to the other. I have no quarrel with Mr. Turner on that point. If by *figura corporis Mei* he meant, "the precise presentment of My body," it would certainly be a good and sound argument to bring against such a one as Marcion, to write, — "There would be no precise presentment, if there had not been a real body to present."

It may be agreed, then, that Tertullian certainly has two uses of *figura*, one carrying the meaning of "symbol," and another carrying the meaning of "reality," and that either meaning will make sense in the immediate connection in which this particular use of *figura* stands. Is it, then, a drawn battle? Or can cause be shown why the decision should be given to one party rather than to the other? I think that we who take *figura* figuratively in this place can really claim the verdict. Tertullian tells us that in a certain correspondence with our Lord's utterance, *Hoc est corpus Meum*, to which he lends

[1] The English phrase is my own suggestion, for which Mr. Turner is in no way responsible, if I have not caught his meaning.

the word *figura* as an explanation, stands an utterance of the prophet Jeremiah, figuratively calling our Lord's body by the name of bread. *Corpus in panem figuravit.* The prophet did not make our Lord's body to have the *figura* (in the sense of substantial fact) of bread. The prophet called our Lord's body "bread" by a figure of speech. At least, that is Tertullian's understanding of the prophet. Then, also, we hear (still according to Tertullian's understanding) our Lord, saying, "This is My body, that is, a figure of My body." These two forms of speech Tertullian brings into parallel. These two forms of speech he *sees* as parallel. What *figura* means in *figuravit in panem, that,* and nothing else, *figura* means in *figura corporis Mei.* In both cases *figura* has a figurative meaning.

It seems to be worth while to point out further that Tertullian's *figura* seems really to be expounded in Augustine's *signum.*[1] And then there is Augustine's rule for deciding whether a Scripture passage is literal or figurative, and his application of it to our Lord's words. Augustine, to be sure, is two hundred years later than Tertullian, but if he may be regarded, and I think that he is generally regarded, as a true representative of the North African tradition, it is clear that Tertullian's *figura corporis Mei* is to be understood as a testimony on the figurative side.

A word let fall by Mr. Turner suggests an interesting train of thought. He says that Tertullian's *figura* sometimes seems to be an equivalent for the Greek χαρακτήρ. The mention of that word, with its great association with *Heb.* i. 3 ("the very impress of His Person," R. V. margin), suggests at once the mystery of the Blessed

[1] See Lecture V, p. 123, "hesitating not to say, 'This is My body,' when He gave a sign of His body."

Trinity. Shall we say that God is One? or that God is Three? No careful theologian would use the latter phrase, but yet it is a phrase that could be used truthfully enough. If you are thinking in terms of Being, God is One. If you are thinking in terms of Personality, God is Three. Our difficulty about our Lord's body is, I submit, that we have not learned to distinguish justly between the material which our Lord uses for His embodiment in various modes of existence, and His own *holding* of these diverse embodiments in an unbreakable unity. As to material, the body natural, the body sacramental, and the body mystical are three. As to the Corporator, if I may coin a new word, or rather thrust upon an old word a meaning of my own coining, these three are one. We are too apt to insist that our Lord shall not be supposed to use one word of our poor human language in several different ways. Yet we are warned by S. Paul that it is within the right of the Great Revealer so to deal with us. We do it ourselves. "All flesh is not the same flesh," we may say. We use the word "body" to mean many things. S. Paul uses that suggestion in 1 Cor. xv. 37–42, to check men from a false literalism touching the doctrine of the resurrection. I think that he would like to see us apply the same check to the discussion of the doctrine of the Eucharist.

NOTE F

ON ORIGEN'S PHRASE ΑΓΙΟΝ ΤΙ

THE Greek of the passage referred to in Lecture III. p. 69, is as follows: *σῶμα γενομένους διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἅγιόν τι καὶ ἁγιάζον.*

It must be perfectly clear to every Greek scholar that ἅγιον and ἁγιάζον are two parallel attributes of σῶμα and that in the phrase ἅγιόν τι the word τι qualifies ἅγιον and ἅγιον alone. It cannot be imagined to belong with σῶμα, with those five other words coming in between. Even if σῶμα ἅγιόν τι in a single group could be the same in meaning as σῶμά τι ἅγιον, which I should not suppose to be the case, this phrase, as it stands, is a clear instance of the idiom in which τις lends indefiniteness of meaning to an adjective.

My attention was directed to this piece of idiom nearly thirty years ago by the Rev. Dr. I. T. Beckwith, then Professor of Greek in Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut. I am again indebted to his kindness for the following references furnished me only a few months since: Kuehner, *Ausfuehrliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, dritte Auflage*, 470. 3[1] (Vol. III. p. 663); Winer's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 25, 2; Liddell and Scott's *Greek Lexicon*, τις A. 8; J. H. Thayer's *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, τις I, a. To these I add a reference to A. T. Robertson's *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, p. 743. Kuehner gives some interesting examples of the idiom: (1) from Homer's Odyssey, xvii. 449, where Antinous insolently addresses Ulysses with the words, — Ὥς τις θαρσαλέος καὶ ἀναίδης ἔσσι προίκτης. ("What an exceedingly bold and shameless beggar art thou!"); (2) from Herodotus, 2, 43, — ἀλλά τις ἀρχαῖός εστι θεός ("But he is a god of immense antiquity"); and (3) from Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, 1, 3, 12, δεινήν τινα λέγεις δύναμιν τοῦ φιλήματος εἶναι.

Dr. Beckwith also calls attention to the interesting New Testament example of this idiom, — φοβερὰ δέ τις

[1] The same paragraph number stands good for the *zweite Auflage*, in which the passage is on pp. 570, 571.

ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως (Heb. x. 27), and sends me extracts from the commentaries of Bernhard Weiss and Von Soden *in loco.*

Weiss says, "The τις brings into especially emphatic prominence, how indefinitely, because immeasurably, fearful this expectation is"; and Von Soden, — " τις is brought in as exalting the φοβερὰ to immensity."

Thayer's *Lexicon* says of τις that "joined to adjectives of quality or quantity, it requires us to conceive of their degree as the greatest possible," and instances, besides Heb. x. 27, Acts viii. 9, — not "some great one," but "a man beyond measure great."

It should be noted that Kuehner holds, and proves by example, that the indefiniteness given by τις to an adjective may be either an indefinite enlargement, or an indefinite *belittling* of the idea. Owners of *Thayer* may do well to correct the phrase, "conceive of their degree as the greatest possible," by adding after "greatest" the words, "or the least." On Heb. x. 27 Alford has a very interesting note, accepting the connection of τις with the adjective. Westcott, on the other hand, connects the τις with the noun, and so do the Revised Versions, which were very much under his influence.

NOTE G

CONCERNING A PASSAGE OF S. CHRYSOSTOM WHICH HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE SUBJECT OF THIS BOOK

It will have been observed by some that I have said nothing of a famous passage of S. Chrysostom from the Homily *On the Betrayal of Judas.* It may be found in Pusey, 211, 212, and in the *P. G.* 49, 380.

"Christ is present now too. The Same who adorned that table adorneth this too now. For it is not man who maketh what lieth there to become the body and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself, who was crucified for us. The priest standeth, filling up a figure, speaking these words [the words of the Liturgy]. The power and grace are of God. 'This is My body,' He [God] saith. This word re-ordereth what lieth there, and as that voice, 'Increase and multiply, and replenish the earth,' was spoken once, but throughout all time in effect giveth power to our race for the procreation of children, so also that voice, once spoken, doth on every table in the churches, from that time even till now, and unto His Coming, complete the sacrifice."

This utterance has been much quoted for two purposes, for neither of which does it stand good. It has been cited in behalf of the theory of Transubstantiation, and it has been used to show that S. Chrysostom held the recital of our Lord's words of distribution to be the instrument of the consecration in the Liturgy. Readers may be referred to Dr. Pusey's treatment of this passage for abundant evidence that S. John Chrysostom attached no idea of a change of substance to the word μεταῤῥυθμίζω. He uses it, for example, of God's "re-ordering" the lions, so that they did not hurt Daniel, cast into their den as an offered prey. No more does this passage avail as showing that our saint attached the consecration in the Eucharist to the priest's recital of the words, "This is My body." On the contrary, he presses two points. (1) The consecration is the act of God, and not of man. Of course, this point must not be taken with a hard literalness, but that is the direction in which the great preacher is looking. (2) He makes the point that as God's word, "Increase and multiply," enables for the propagation of the human race through all the ages since, exactly so the word of Christ, proclaiming that

certain hallowed bread is His body, gives the bread and wine of the Church's altars a new place and relation in the universe, from that time forth, until His coming again. It is right to find a higher meaning of μεταῤῥυθμίζω here than in any other passage where S. Chrysostom ever used it, because this was the greatest change of ῥυθμός that the saint had ever had brought before his mind. But certainly the present tense here is not a present of repeated action, new at every altar and in every consecration, but a present of eternal, never-failing fact. The words of our Lord, sounding in the spaces of the upper room in Jerusalem, did not die on the air. They live in heaven. They took up those elements of bread and wine, as matter offered to God in sacrifice, — not those particular portions which the Apostles saw, but all bread and wine thus offered in all coming time, — and gave them a new rhythm in the harmony of the spheres. It seems to me entirely clear that the orator means distinctly that it is the voice of our Lord Himself, sounding once in the upper room, and not the words of our Lord, repeated over and over by a priest, here or there, on this occasion or on that, that must be understood as giving to the elements a new character and a new place in the order of God's world.

The passage is deeply interesting and touching, but it has nothing to say about either of the subjects in connection with which it is commonly adduced.

NOTE H

ON THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST, AS SEEN BY A MODERN ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOLAR

A SMALL man may point out mistakes in the work of a great man. If there be a mistake there, it is the business of any one who happens to see it, to call attention to it. The lesser man may not praise the greater man without some danger of seeming to be presumptuous. But that danger must not be allowed to prevent the writer of these Lectures from calling attention to the power and charm of certain *Studies* of that eminent French scholar, Mgr. Batiffol. He has put forth two series of Studies, under the title *Études d'Histoire et de Théologie Positive.* The second series is a little volume on *Conversion and Transubstantiation in the Holy Eucharist.* The author combines that logical movement of thought and that clearness of expression which one expects in a French writer, with the fearless honesty of the chivalrous gentleman of every race. John Bunyan in his *Pilgrim's Progress* introduces a character whom he calls Mr. Facing-both-ways. He has no Mr. Facing-the-facts, in his allegory. Perhaps in the angry controversies of the sixteenth century he had not encountered any such enquirer. But here we have a fine example of the honest gentleman who faces facts, even the most disagreeable, and salutes them, as the soldier salutes his superior officer. On p. 379 of his *Études: deuxième série* he uses the phrase, *La critique objective.* Of that *sub*jective criticism of which so much has been "made in Germany," which settles with itself how the history of the Church ought to have gone, and then proceeds to prove, with enormous diligence and

considerable acumen, that it did go so, Mgr. Batiffol will have nothing. He has, to be sure, his own prepossessions. He holds, for instance, that the history of Christian thought is an evolution in which the spirit of God has led the Church step by step to a fulness of vision and of wisdom embodied at last in the decrees of the Council of Trent. But while he thus holds that the highest truth that has as yet been given to the Church to know concerning the Holy Eucharist is expressed in the Tridentine Decree defining the dogma of Transubstantiation, he studies the Fathers with absolute and fearless freedom, and pronounces that the vision of that dogma was not given to their eyes to see. Some came very near it, in the judgment of Mgr. Batiffol. S. Gregory of Nyssa and S. John Chrysostom are his particular heroes in the East, and S. Ambrose in the West. But none of them quite saw the vision. He is rather severe on S. Augustine, whose mistakes he points out most faithfully, and whose great authority he tells us (on his p. 246), kept back the Latin-speaking Church from the healthy and proper development of its own eucharistic doctrine until the ninth century. Secure in his theory of development, he can show how unhappily Gelasius I misconceived the Church's tradition, Pope and canonized Saint though he be. Indeed, Mgr. Batiffol regards as especially mischievous that Incarnation-analogy which we have found cropping up in every century. "*Cette analogie trompeuse*," he calls it, "*entre l'Incarnation et l'Eucharistie*," and he says of it (on his pp. 324, 325) that it will appear no more after the definitive victory of the theology of S. Cyril of Alexandria, under Justin and Justinian, in the middle of the sixth century. But that is one of the small mistakes of a great teacher, for Mgr. Batiffol himself writes (on his p. 333) of S. John of Da-

mascus, two centuries later than Justin and Justinian, as holding to the analogy of the Incarnation, which he certainly did.

It may be worth while to mention a few of the interpretations given by this clear-eyed Catholic scholar to writings of the Church's early days. Thus, while he greatly mislikes such an analogy himself, he says of Justin Martyr (140 [1]), that the thought of Justin "judges the Eucharist by an analogy with the Incarnation." On the other side of the account, our scholar translates *δι' εὐχῆς λόγου*, *par une parole de prière*, and later refers to this *parole* as *la formule de prière qui nous avons reçue de Jésus*. We have been over this ground in Lecture II.

Passing to Irenaeus, we find (153, 154) the two elements, "earthly" and "heavenly," of which the Eucharist consists, made out by our French critic to be "the flesh of Christ" (the earthly) and "the Spirit of Christ" (the heavenly). His idea of the heavenly part seems to be that which is ascribed to Irenaeus in Lecture II. But what can Mgr. Batiffol mean by calling "the flesh of Christ" an "earthly" element? To S. Irenaeus the consecrated bread was certainly "earthly," and as certainly "the flesh of Christ." But can our Lord's glorified body be called an "earthly" element? I suppose that our critic would say, "Yes! When it dwells on earth, it is earthly." Whether I represent his mind in this point, I am not quite sure, but he, in his turn, feels a difficulty in representing Irenaeus. "One is surprised," he says (158), "that Irenaeus speaks of the first-fruits of the creation, the bread and the wine, as if in the Eucharist the bread and wine remained (*subsistaient*), and could be theoretically distinguished from the body and blood."

[1] Numbers in parenthesis in this note are to be understood as referring to pages of Mgr. Batiffol's volume.

This distinguishing the bread and wine from the body and blood is exactly what Irenaeus never does, and none of the Fathers do, if I have understood them. But, of course, Mgr. Batiffol is assuming that "body" must mean "glorified body," and, of course, Irenaeus did distinguish in theory between the body eucharistic and the body natural. Then our author asks a question. He has no doubt about the "Realism" of Irenaeus, but did Irenaeus find his own explanation of it in a *transmutatio* which did not annihilate the bread and wine, a *transmutatio* analogous to that which is produced in a wild-olive tree by grafting? That is the modern Frenchman's question, and he cannot answer it securely in his own mind. "The question remains an enigma," he says. He seems to me to come very near to my understanding of Irenaeus.

Mgr. Batiffol recognizes in Clement of Alexandria the disposition to treat the Incarnation and the Eucharist as analogous mysteries, but he is dissatisfied with Clement's mysticisms, which he does not approach in a friendly spirit. "Who would accept (180) as a workable theory of the Eucharist, or of the Incarnation either, this idea of κρᾶσις?" In dealing with Origen he has (191, 192), a striking suggestion: "We may remind ourselves in this connection that Cardinal Bellarmine gives us authority for seeing in the eucharistic, or sacramental, body a symbol of the historic body, or of the body glorified." [1]

I had expected to be sharply criticized for allowing myself to use any such phrase as "eucharistic body," or "sacramental body." It is interesting to have the authority of a Roman Cardinal for it. I may add that

[1] Cardinal Bellarmine autorise à voir dans le corps eucharistique ou sacramentel un symbole du corps historique, du corps glorieux.

in speaking (216) of Tertullian's phrase, *corpus Meum, id est, figura corporis Mei*, Mgr. Batiffol makes the outward appearance to be the *figura*, and quotes Vasquez for it, but he scorns the idea that Tertullian was a Realist in a sense satisfactory to modern Catholics. "Tertullian opposes figure and reality. . . . No subtlety of exegesis will make it possible to say that Tertullian acknowledged in the Eucharist the reality of the body, — I mean, that he saw there the natural body of Christ."

On S. Augustine our author is vastly interesting. "The teaching of S. Augustine on the Eucharist," he says (326), "has to this day been for us theologians one of the most difficult to bring into consistency with itself, or to harmonize with that of a Gregory of Nyssa, an Ambrose, or a Chrysostom." But put him in his proper place, the critic says, as just representing the (rather poor and low) African tradition of Tertullian and S. Cyprian, a little more thought out, and you will have no trouble in understanding him. But this hardly allows weight enough, it seems to me, to the fact that the young man Augustine was a follower, an admirer, and a personal pupil of S. Ambrose. Augustine is, as a matter of fact, in the Ambrosian succession, as well as in the African, and the writings of S. Augustine should be considered in weighing what S. Ambrose really meant, himself.

Mgr. Batiffol represents S. Augustine (235) as holding that there is "nothing sensible" in the Eucharist, and that Christ could not give His natural body to be eaten and His natural blood to be drunk, for this reason, before all others, that the natural body is now glorified in heaven. "Neither Augustine nor Gregory [of Nyssa]," he says, "dreams of identifying strictly [*ne songent à identifier proprement*] the eucharistic body and the glorified body of Christ."

On (246), still speaking of S. Augustine, our author tells us that "Greek theology will come clear [*La Dogmatique grecque s'en dégagera*] with S. Gregory of Nyssa, Latin theology with S. Ambrose." [1] Thus he credits S. Gregory of Nyssa with having made a distinct advance toward the idea of a "Conversion" in the Eucharist. At the same time he sees clearly (256–258) that S. Gregory did not hold to the modern theory of Transubstantiation, any more than he can be satisfied to accept the suggestion of an eminent German scholar, Dr. Loofs, that S. Gregory attached himself to a theory of "Impanation." Mgr. Batiffol complains that there is a defect in S. Gregory's view. That view declares that food is turned to nutriment "by a certain transforming power" [διὰ τῆς ἀλλοιωτικῆς δυνάμεως]. There must be, then, according to S. Gregory's argument from analogy, a "transforming power" in the Eucharist. The French critic sees as clearly as I do that that "transforming power" is the Divine Word. Nothing is said of the *body* of the Word. "*Le Verbe lui-même sera cette* ἀλλοιωτικὴ δύναμις. *Ici apparait le déficit de la théorie de Grégoire de Nysse.*" Mgr. Batiffol does not deign to shelter himself behind the suggestion that the Word cannot be present in the Eucharist without His body. He is quite clear that S. Gregory did not think of the natural body as being there.

For this is the way in which our French devotee of a truly "objective" historical study goes on, speaking still of S. Gregory:

"He did not at all realize [*Il n'a pas soupçonné*] that the eucharistic body which he was assigning to the Word was a new body, a body different from the historic body. The Word

[1] As if S. Ambrose was later than S. Augustine, instead of being his honored master!

assigns to Himself a body for the purpose of the Eucharist, as He assigned to Himself a body for the purpose of the Incarnation. And He can say of this eucharistic body, 'This is My body,' since this body is His. But this body is not that which was born, and which suffered."

The last words, "This body is not that which was born, and which suffered," are, of course, the critic's conclusion from S. Gregory's thought. I hold it to be, to a certain extent, a just conclusion. Yet I am sure that S. Gregory himself would have said of such a statement, "In one sense, Yes, and in another sense, No." He would have held, with the Fathers generally, that anything which our Lord takes to be His body becomes thereby identified with His body now in glory, and with His body of all His earthly life. In a sense, it is other; in a sense, it is the same. It is a noteworthy point that Mgr. Batiffol finds fault with S. Gregory for using such qualifying phrases as "in some way" [*τρόπον τινά*] and "in some sense" [*λόγῳ τινί*]. These phrases seem to the modern writer to imply the negation of that "substantial conversion" of which Gregory of Nyssa is supposed to have had some clear idea at first. In fact, the French theologian's statement that with Gregory of Nyssa Greek theology "came clear," is found to mean only that Gregory had a clear understanding that the eucharistic elements suffered a conversion. What that conversion really was, he did not at all see, in the opinion of Mgr. Batiffol.

Passing on to the fifth century, our author deals with Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret. Even Cyril "did not sound (274) the depths of the mystery of the mode of the Real Presence, and as soon as he sets himself to determine what the bread is, under the forms of which the body of the Saviour is given, the thought of Cyril is

at once obscured." I cannot but suggest that if so clear-headed a thinker as Mgr. Batiffol cannot understand the thought of so clear-headed a thinker as S. Cyril of Alexandria, it really seems as if the modern student was trying a lock for which he had not found the right key. But of one thing Mgr. Batiffol is quite sure: it was the Christologic question alone that was occupying the minds of both Cyril and Nestorius. *The doctrine of the Eucharist was not in controversy between them.*

Our author deals with Theodoret (278–284). We must not be scandalized, if Theodoret's attempt at a theory of the Eucharist is found to be no more happy than that of Gregory of Nyssa, much less so, in fact. The passages from the *Eranistes* are examined, and it is clearly recognized that Theodoret holds to a "dyophysism" in the Eucharist, as in the Incarnation. But I think that the French critic does not quite do justice to Theodoret in two points. For, first, he makes out Theodoret to give to the glorified body of our Lord the same relation to the bread of the Eucharist that our Lord's Divinity has to His flesh, — "*Le corps du Verbe, qui est au pain eucharistique ce qui la Divinité est à l'humanité dans l'Incarnation*," is the phrase of Mgr. Batiffol (284) — whereas Theodoret really makes the Heavenly Word to be related to the bread of the Eucharist, as to the flesh of the Incarnation, which is a very different view. Then, secondly, Mgr. Batiffol (281) approves thoroughly of the language put into the mouth of the Monophysite opponent, who says that after the Invocation the bread and wine "are changed and become other," but our critic implies that Theodoret himself thought this to be bad theology. I must repeat here what I have said in Lecture VII, that Theodoret seems rather to have been appealing to the doctrine of the Eucharist as

to something which all Christians held in common, and that every statement concerning the Eucharist made in the *Dialogues* should be understood as accepted by both speakers — they never contradict one another in this matter, — and as the belief of Theodoret himself.

Certainly this 12mo. volume of some 350 pages is most interesting. One could wish to see it published in an authorized English translation.

NOTE I

FURTHER LIGHT ON MACARIUS MAGNES

Just as this volume is going to press I receive by the kindness of an English scholar, the Rev. T. W. Crafer, who has been preparing a translation of Macarius Magnes for publication by the S. P. C. K, a copy (made by hand) of the Greek of the passage about the Holy Eucharist from the *Apocritica* (see my pages 157–160). He has sent me also some papers of his own reprinted from the *Journal of Theological Studies* (April and July, 1907, and April and July, 1914), in which he maintains very interestingly that these dialogues are a record of a real debate, that the heathen critic was Hierocles, a Roman magistrate who flourished about A.D. 300 in some of the Asiatic provinces, that the Christian apologist was a devoted follower of Origen, not at all an anti-Origenist, as Macarius, the bishop of a century later was, and that if Macarius of Magnesia really had anything to do with these dialogues, it must have been as an editor of a writing of long before.

I am not able to discuss the question. I will only mention as a point which does not seem to have been touched by the disputants, that the objection to the use

of the word "type" for the consecrated elements seems to suggest the theology of the beginning of the fifth century rather than that of a hundred years earlier. If, however, Macarius of Magnesia edited a book of a forgotten author, we are left in utter obscurity as to the dating of particular opinions which may appear in the book in its present form, except, of course, that Origenistic utterances must plainly be ascribed to the earlier writer.

For purposes of my own book I am very glad to be able to give the Greek of the passage in which Macarius speaks of "the body which is the bread, and the blood which bears the character of the wine." It runs thus: *τὸ αἷμα ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ ἄρτος, καὶ τὸ σῶμα ὅπερ τυγχάνει ὁ οἶνος.* With this use of *τυγχάνει* it is interesting to compare a passage of S. Cyril of Jerusalem quoted above, p. 101.

There is also an interesting passage in which Macarius says that our Lord has taught us "that body and blood are alike from the earth, and have both the same substance": *ἐκ γῆς εἶναι τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸν ἄρτον, καὶ μίαν ἑκάτερα κεκτῆσθαι τὴν οὐσίαν.* The same matter could be either bread or body, according to this view. It would depend upon the use made of it in the economy of God.

CATH[illegible]AN LIBRARY
[illegible] BAN

Institute for Worship Studies
Florida Campus
10000012133
BV
825
.W3
1919

Institute for Worship Studies
Florida Campus
10000012133